

## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 18, 2015

A meeting of the Planning Committee of the County of Kaua'i, State of Hawai'i, was called to order by Mason K. Chock, Chair, at the Council Chambers, 4396 Rice Street, Suite 201, Lihue, Kaua'i, on Wednesday, March 18, 2015, at 9:09 a.m., after which the following members answered the call of the roll:

Honorable Gary L. Hooser  
Honorable Ross Kagawa  
Honorable Mason K. Chock  
Honorable JoAnn A. Yukimura, Ex-Officio Member  
Honorable Mel Rapozo, Ex-Officio Member

Excused: Honorable KipuKai Kualii  
Recused: Honorable Arryl Kaneshiro

There being no objections, the meeting recessed at 9:09 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:26 a.m., and proceeded as follows:

*(Councilmember Kaneshiro is noted as recused.)*

The Committee proceeded on its agenda item, as follows:

Bill No. 2576	A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING REGULATIONS, PROCEDURES, ZONING, DEVELOPMENT PLANS, AND FUTURE GROWTH AREAS FOR THE SOUTH KAUA'I PLANNING DISTRICT, AND ESTABLISHING EXCEPTIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND ADDITIONS TO CHAPTER 8 AND CHAPTER 9, KAUA'I COUNTY CODE 1987, AS AMENDED <b>(This item was Deferred.)</b>
---------------	---

Committee Chair Chock: Aloha and good morning. We are back from our caption break and I would like to reconvene the Planning Committee. If I could indulge you for a few minutes, we have three (3) items for the Planning Committee today. We will be taking the South Kaua'i Community Plan (SKCP) first, and for Bill No. 2577 and Bill No. 2578, the request has been to defer. I just wanted to say that up front that we have a request from Mr. Max Graham and our Planning Director and Attorney to defer, so we will be doing that. In addition to the South Kaua'i Community Plan, we will also be looking to defer, but this morning what I would like to take care of as much as possible in our Planning Committee for the South Kaua'i Community Plan is to cover an amendment for the Bill, but we will do that after we hear from our consultant and our Planning Department on the process and the actual plan. We will take public testimony, which probably will not happen until after lunch. My understanding is that the presentation is sixty (60) to ninety (90) minutes long, but I think it is important that we hear that presentation first. Then, we will be taking any questions and answers after public testimony this afternoon, and any potential amendments moving forward. We will then be deferring to come back to some housekeeping amendments and any others that

come out from the Council on April 15th. That is how we are going to work through this. At this time, if there are no questions or clarifications on this process for today, I will suspend the rules and have our consultant Kimi Yuen from PBR-Hawai'i, Planning Director Mike Dahilig, Long-Range Planner Marie Williams, and Planner Marisa Valenciano up.

MICHAEL A. DAHILIG, Planning Director: Thank you, Committee Chair and Honorable Members. For the record, Mike Dahilig with the Department of Planning. I am pleased to, again as we did a couple of weeks ago, present to this Council the Draft South Kaua'i Community Plan. This plan is a culmination of work that has been conducted over the past two (2) years and this was a project that was funded by this Council in the Budget, and we have subsequently gone through the community process of trying to take a look at what the community's visions are for this particular planning district, as designated by the Council, and have gone through a very intensive community-based process to try to get a big picture and get consensus around certain items that will help put us through the future. We have retained this part of the project with Kimi Yuen and the firm of PBR-Hawai'i & Associates. She is here with us today and I am going to turn the presentation over to her, but I just want to, again as the Chair mentioned, acknowledge the work that she has done on behalf of the County, as well as our Chief Project Manager on this end Marie Williams, who has also been assisted by Marisa Valenciano, who is another one of my Long-Range Planners. Lee Steinmetz is also there as well. He has been very instrumental in a lot of the transportation elements of the plan. I also want to acknowledge Ruby Pap, who has helped us with some of the shoreline and coastal hazard items in our plan that we have tried to fold in as part of this innovative process. Without further ado, I would like to turn it over to Kimi.

KIMI YUEN, Lead Consultant, PBR-Hawai'i: *Aloha* and good morning Council Chair Rapozo, Committee Chair Chock, and the Members of the County Council. Thank you for having me and our team here today. It is an absolute pleasure to be here. Director Dahilig highly recognizes us as members who put the plan together, but really this was a team effort and a community effort. This started off with a Mayor-appointed Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), but then it also involved your department heads. We had meetings with your department heads in the County. Because really, this is a solution that needs to come from multiple angles and as you heard in the morning today, one (1) agency alone cannot do it; one (1) Planning Department cannot do it; and the community alone cannot do it. It has to be a team effort and it is something that we really try to do with this plan. Without further ado, let us get started.

Committee Chair Chock: Sorry, just a quick interjection here just for process again. Members, what I would like to do is hear the whole presentation. So if you can be proficient in writing down your questions at this time, we would like to get to those questions and answers after public testimony. Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: Just in terms of if we need a clarification of a term or an acronym, can we pose that?

Committee Chair Chock: That is fine.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: I also wanted to recognize that we do have members of our CAC, the "Citizen Advisory Committee," that are here today that

are in support of our plan and I wanted to acknowledge them and thank them for all of their hard work that went into this. In brief, our agenda for today is to go over the purpose of the South Kaua'i Community Plan and to go over some of the two thousand thirty-five (2,035) growth projections that really was a basis of this plan, and this is County-wide projections and it will go into more detail about the districts. After that, we will go through the process, as well as there is a new concept that we are introducing called "form-based code" and we will set some time aside to really explain what that is. It is quite a bit different from your typical zoning code and we will get into the reasons for it as we go through this. Afterwards will be the implementation and next steps, and then questions.

We are here today to update the County's South Kaua'i Community Plan, which is technically your development plan by Charter. As you can see, there are different ones for each of the different districts around the island. We are focused on South Kaua'i, which was last updated...which was probably the first one that was created in 1978. Since your General Plan (GP) was actually first adopted in 1971, your County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance (CZO) was in 1972, and these plans followed quickly after in the 70s and 80s to take a closer look at the regional future projections and growth for the island. As you can see, it is a little bit incoming. In general, the purpose of the South Kaua'i Community Plan is to provide guidance for the County on where growth should go and not go in South Kaua'i and how we should grow. We are discussing how to better take care of our communities; families; cultural resources; the land and ocean; and make recommendations on transportation and circulation within, as well as to and from our district; and set priorities for public improvements. I just want to take a little time here to talk about public improvements and the infrastructure. When we met with the County department and agency heads, it was an eye opener for them because up until now, whenever you get proposals for different developments or projects that come to them, they have had to be reactionary. They have never been able to think proactively about what or where growth is appropriate in the County and specifically in our district. For them, you have not had an updated development plan or community plan since the 70s, so for them "lightbulbs went off," thinking like, "Okay, if we have a community plan that is developed with input from our community, residents, and visitors, and we all can figure out what are the appropriate ways development can happen or ways we can accommodate growth, and where it should go and where it should not go," then they could start seeing how to prioritize actual improvement projects. Going from what they have been used to doing for the past thirty (30) plus years is being reactionary to all of these projects and developments that come to them and start thinking, "Okay, we start looking at our long-range plans and we start thinking holistically about our districts and about our island," and it starts to make sense to them like, "Okay, we know that this is where people wanted to have the growth happen, so that is where we start to invest in our public infrastructure." That is kind of also a major purpose of this plan, and then to also look at encouraging different economic diversity and sustainability issues.

Everyone's favorite word is "growth," right? It has been a hot-button issue that people are scared to talk about, but if you really look at what growth is composed of, you are talking about your own *keiki*, your children and making sure that we are thinking forward about what their communities will be like in the future. If you look at recent population changes on the island of Kaua'i, between 2000 and 2010, you had nearly eight hundred (800) births per year. Within the following two (2) years between 2010 and 2012, you actually started having a lot more babies on Kaua'i at almost one thousand (1,000) babies per year. Now, to get

to the net population change for the island just in natural terms, births; you take away the deaths that happen annually and you have a net natural change of about three hundred (300) to four hundred (400) more people on the island just by those numbers alone. If you start looking at people who, as we heard earlier this morning, want to come to Kaua'i because it is such a beautiful place, you have international, as well as domestic migration to Kaua'i, and you get a net migration of about three hundred (300) people per year. When you add the four hundred (400) more people that are on the island, as well as people coming to the island through migration, you are having six hundred (600) to seven hundred (700) more people to accommodate every year. This is something that, as Chair Rapozo mentioned, is just going to keep happening because Kaua'i is so beautiful and people have babies; that is just a natural thing. That is the growth.

Taking a closer look at migration itself, you will see in more recent years that in-migration and out-migration have been starting to balance each other out a little bit and it is hovering about one thousand one hundred (1,100) people per year. If you take a look at how that is impacting your age distribution on Kaua'i, again like was mentioned earlier, you are having a grain of Kaua'i's population. The red line shows the increasing median age for people who live on Kaua'i, which has gone from about a median age of thirty-five (35) in 1990 to forty-two (42) in 2012. With increasing age in your population, you actually have a discrepancy between the affordability for people to afford the housing that is on Kaua'i. If you look at the far left chart, it is your housing demand. That is the breakdown of what is affordable to different affordability income levels, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) income levels; that is the federal standards. You will see that really compared to the housing that is actually being built on Kaua'i, nearly sixty percent (60%) is only affordable to those making one hundred eighty percent (180%) of your area median income. There is a start discrepancy between what people can afford and what is being built. In a lot of planning circles, it is called "this missing middle" in terms of providing housing. If you really think about it, the people who are getting priced out are your *keiki* that are moving out of your houses. Their first time job, whether they are working retail or maybe at a restaurant or just starting out, they do not have the ability to pay for the housing that is being provided on Kaua'i.

This table is a little busy, but let me explain it. This is straight from SMS's growth projections that were done islandwide in support of your General Plan Update that is coming up. If you look at the top bar, you can see that the total population between 1990 and 2035 is projected to increase from fifty-one thousand six hundred seventy-six (51,676) to eighty-eight thousand thirteen (88,013). Breaking that down— it seems like a huge number, but in that timespan, it averages out to a very modest annual growth rate of just over one percent (1%) and in the projections going forward, SMS used the middle projection rather than the high or low annual growth rate, and that is one point one percent (1.1%). Applying that to your current populations is how they came to that number in 2035. From there, they worked with another...I believe it is a citizen advisory committee... Technical Advisory Committee for the General Plan, and they worked out how that population should get distributed amongst the different community plan districts. We have Līhu'e, Kōloa, Po'ipū, and Kalāheo, which is our South Kaua'i District. Hanapēpē, 'Ele'ele, Waimea, Hanalei, and the North Shore, as well as Kapa'a and East Kaua'i. What we are showing in the percentages that are either red or green in that 2035 column below the number is each district's share at that time and whether it went up or down from 1990. The idea is that you can see that part of the projections was a bit of reallocating of where population growth should occur. Logically, Līhu'e is your government, business, and employment center on the

island, so they shifted more than a quarter of the population for Kaua'i to Līhu'e. For South Kaua'i, it has increased a little bit, but it is still in the eighteen percent (18%) to nineteen percent (19%) of the island's population projection. Hanapēpē has also another slight increase, but if you look at Waimea, Hanalei, and Kapa'a or east side, they have given them smaller percentages of the total population growth projected. Graphically, it looks like this and I think I tried to match colors so that is it kind of instinctive for people on Kaua'i, right? Līhu'e is in the red bar. East Kaua'i; Kapa'a side is the light green. Our South Kaua'i is kind of that dark aqua. You can see that the proportion of the population is heavy in those three (3) districts. The other three (3) districts have a much smaller share and are not expected to grow just because they are seen as more rural communities and the ideas to preserve your rural communities as rural communities; the typical "keep the country, country." That is kind of the logic behind the distribution of the population projections. Similarly, when you start looking at the housing units that were projected by SMS as part of their General Plan Tech Study— I have set the table up the same way where on the top you can see the number of housing units and its projected growth. Again, it is the middle growth rate that they used for the projection, not the high or the low. It is very modest at one point one percent (1.1%) per year. Similarly, you can see the breakdown of where the housing units were allocated by the General Plan Tech Study Committee. You can see that Līhu'e is taking a much larger share, going from twenty percent (20%) to twenty-five percent (25%) of the projected housing units. South Kaua'i is increasing modestly from about nineteen and a half percent (19.5%) to almost twenty-one percent (21%). Kapa'a has been allocated quite a few more housing units. If you look back in time in 2000, you can really see where maybe the east side...this might help what is going on with the east side traffic issues, but in 2000, you nearly doubled the number of housing units on the east side, which is that plus ninety-three percent (93%) between 1990 and 2000 numbers. Again, from there it has been a modest increase to ten thousand (10,000) for the east side. Again, the other three (3) more rural areas are expected to have a smaller proportion of housing units by 2035. Graphically, this is what it looks like again and just to show that they are really ramping up Līhu'e's share because it makes the most sense to locate your housing units close to where your jobs are, so you reduce the impact to your transportation system and roadways. East Kaua'i had that big jump like we mentioned in the 90s and early 2000s, and then it is tapering off. It still does have the highest proportion of islandwide housing units projected. South Kaua'i has a pretty steady increase as you can see going forward.

We also wanted to show visitor units by the planning district because this also impacts some of the concepts and ideas that were integrated into our community plan. For visitor units, it is the same thing: the total for Kaua'i is on the top and the average annual growth rate is right below that. You can see the projections going forward. Again, they used the middle range, not the high or the low. It is really very modest at point three eight percent (0.38%) growth per year. With that, you can start to see the shift on where these visitor units are being allocated in the districts. Līhu'e is actually taking a slightly smaller share of the total projected visitor units. It is still an increase from 2000, but it is still hovering around the sixteen percent (16%) range. South Kaua'i actually has the highest proportion of visitor units. Even from the 2000 numbers, it had a third of the island's visitor units already, and then in the future, they are actually projecting a slightly larger share of the islandwide visitor units projected for 2035. For South Kaua'i, we had to take a look at that as well. East Kaua'i got a smaller share going from twenty-six point seven percent (26.7%) to twenty-two point four percent (22.4%) and the others stayed pretty small and modest.

On the last slide regarding the growth projections from SMS, it had to do with jobs by planning district. Again, the top bar has the total for the island. The second line is the average annual growth rate that was applied. Again, it is a very modest growth rate. It is less than one percent (1%); it is maybe closer to half a percent (0.5%) per year. That may be saying something about the economy as well, but at the same time, the idea is to understand where the growth projections are and what is happening. You can see the bulk of that growth is expected to happen to Līhu'e, which is probably why they locate the bulk of the population in housing units to Līhu'e to look at them closer to where the jobs will be.

Now getting back to our specific planning district, this map shows in black the boundaries between the different districts from the original 1970-1980 era development plans (DPs). In red is the new boundaries for the South Kaua'i Planning District. You can see that it shifted all the way west to Wahiawa Gulch, so there is a little bit of mismatching and how this is going forward and it has impacted a little bit of some of the planning, but just to give you a sense of how the boundaries were redrawn a little bit.

The previous plan from 1978 provided land use maps and this is the one for the Kōloa-Po'ipū-Kukui'ula subarea in yellow. Those were the residential. The pink areas were resort. The green area was golf courses, parks, or open space. The blue is public facilities. You could see that the projected land use pattern extended from the Kukui'ula on the west side and past actually...it does not show...this was prior to the Grand Hyatt being built, but it showed actually residential all the way to Māhā'ulepū. Then there is an urban design plan that was done for the Kōloa Town Core and that is what you see in the upper left corner. This was the composite plan that was done for the Kalāheo-Lāwa'i-'Ōma'o subareas. Again, the colors are the same with yellow being the projected residential areas; green is the parks and open spaces; and the dark green on this one was actually your gulches and open space kind of land uses; and then the blue is the public facilities. They did more of a kind of a roadway plan for Kalāheo Town in their urban design plan, which is on the upper left.

Again, I want to acknowledge and reiterate that this was truly a team effort. We had wonderful support from a broad array of citizens on our advisory committee. We have got members of our Planning Department that included Peter Nakamura, who we sadly lost early in this process. I still get a little choked up. We also wanted to acknowledge, and we did not put her on the list, but Stella Burgess also helped as part of the plan and gave some really amazing talks about the cultural resources in Po'ipū. I wanted to recognize them as well. The consultant team consisted of ourselves, PBR-Hawai'i, as the lead. We brought in Opticos Design, who are experts in form-based code, and they are based in Berkeley, California, but they were here quite frequently and participated in a lot of the CAC and public meetings. Fehr & Peers was our traffic and transportation engineers; the Limtiaco Consulting Group were our civil engineers; and Ron Ho & Associates, Inc., took a look at electrical. Members on our Citizen Advisory Committee are shown on this slide, but I will not go through it. It was a very wide range of residents, businesses, and landowners. I have to say that I truly enjoyed our meetings. It was a lot of fun. We had great participation. Nearly all of them showed up to every meeting and they have shown up to other open house events. It was actually a lot of fun. We were able to openly discuss some really tough issues that South Kaua'i is facing and I think through the plan, you will see that it is really a holistic approach to the growth projections that were given to us and what we are trying to do to see how we

can preserve South Kaua'i and its charm, beauty, natural resources, and as well as take care of our future generations and people who want to come here to live and see how that can all work together.

For the planning process, this is just a quick overview. We broke down into four (4) basic steps: step one was to take a look at existing conditions, trends, growth projections, to start understanding what the core values were of the community, and to develop a community profile report, which I think is over two hundred (200) pages. If anybody is interested, I think it is posted on our website. Step two was visioning, "Where do we want to be in the future in 2035" and to look at alternative scenarios. Step three was, "How do we get there?" We started to narrow and zoom in on a preferred scenario and see how that could work, start developing goals and strategies, policies, and actions to make that happen, and that all came together in a draft community plan. We are here today at step four of going through the review and adoption process. We did go through the Planning Commission at the end of last year and today we are here at the County Council to hopefully put some final touches on the plan. Again, just to reiterate that we took a look and we approached this from a holistic, sustainable standpoint where you are looking at the environment, community, and a livable, built environment for all, as well as the economy and looking at resiliency, and to try to create a multifaceted solution to some of the issues. With that, I want to turn the discussion over to Marisa Valenciano, who will go over the public process that we started with our kick-off events.

MARISA VALENCIANO, Planner: From the beginning, our goal was always to reach out to as many South Kaua'i residents as possible and we wanted to do this in order to explain what this plan was about, but also the planning process itself and to also get residents involved early on in our process. To do this, we focused on three (3) public kick-off events that were fun and also interactive. These events were going to take place in Kōloa, Kalāheo, and Po'ipū. At our first event in Po'ipū, we tried something different. Rather than go to the community or have the community come to us, we went out into the community. We packed up our office and we rented out these two (2) pavilions at Po'ipū Beach Park and we hung up banners and brought food. We also covered the picnic table benches with our posters and maps. As you can see in this slide, we have the visual preference survey and what this was, was basically our consultants taking pictures of different areas around South Kaua'i, and then the residents and community people going ahead and placing dot stickers on pictures that they generally agreed, liked, and disliked, which they did with green colored dots. This exercise was mainly to gauge and get an understanding for what the community felt like were the building types and housing forms that people liked and disliked. In this picture, you can see that we laid out our maps on the picnic tables as well and we allowed the community to write directly on the maps and scratch it up, and we did this to allow them to be able to identify the issues and opportunities throughout the region. In addition to the exercises we had on the picnic tables, we also had a kid-zone section and we put out our plain butcher paper and kids were able to come with their parents and draw or write out their wish for South Kaua'i. To give you some background, we invited the entire South Kaua'i community and we sent over six thousand three hundred (6,300) wish cards. On one side of the wish card that Mike is holding up for me was a detailed list of all the events and on this backside more importantly was a blank card and it provided an opportunity for the community to essentially write their wish for South Kaua'i and we encouraged them to mail that back to us, so that we could collect input. In total, we got over one hundred (100) people at the Po'ipū Beach Park and we even got press and an article in The Garden Island Newspaper.



Within the same month of June 2013, we also had our Kōloa and Kalāheo public kick-off events and we did this at the Kōloa Neighborhood Center and at the Kalāheo Neighborhood Center. These types of meetings were a little different from the Po'ipū one and that we followed a more traditional meeting format. We had about fifty (50) people at the Kōloa Neighborhood Center event and we had about sixty (60) people at the Kalāheo event. The focus of this meeting was basically a formal presentation by staff to go over kind of what I mentioned: the purpose of the plan, the planning process itself, and kind of letting residents or community members know how they can get involved in the process early on. Another thing that we did at this time was collect immediate input and we did this by having clickers and polling responses. We asked the community members questions such as, "What do you like most or least about living or working in South Kaua'i?" We were able to collect that input as well. Also, in the Kōloa and Kalāheo meetings, before and after the formal presentations, we had an open house section and this allowed the community to kind of look over the responses that were collected from the Po'ipū event, as well as allow community members the opportunity to provide their own comments. At this time, it was also great because a lot of the people who attended these events were able to directly and informally talk to staff about questions that they had or issues or concerns that they wanted us to address. In summary, our public outreach strategy was always to cast a wide net in trying to reach out to as many people as we could. We really got the word out there through mail outs, E-mails, flyers, and we also had newspaper articles as well as radio ads. We provided numerous opportunities for people to get involved. In addition to the public kick-off events that I went over today, we also had online surveys and some of our staff actually went door to door and walked out in the community and talked to people and asked them questions about living and working in South Kaua'i. In addition to that, we also maintained a website and had a project E-mail list of over three hundred (300) people. In addition to all of that, we provided passive means of input and we did this through having the open house style format, initiating the wish card campaign, and also taking advantage of social media through Instagram and Facebook.

Ms. Yuen: Just as a follow-up and to reiterate, at the kick-off of this, we actually mailed those wish cards as invites to all residents within the district, so over six thousand three hundred (6,300) of those wish cards were mailed out inviting folks to share their thoughts and opinions. Thank you, Marisa. That was awesome. We wanted to summarize some of the responses we got through those kick-off meetings. Through social media, we got nearly seven hundred (700) individual comments. Some people made multiple comments, but it was a pretty broad, wide range of input through all of the E-mails, social media, as well as the wish cards that were handed back to the Planning Department, mailed back to us, and turned in at some of these events. I just wanted to summarize the top five (5) issues that came out of those kick-off events. The number one by far was improving pedestrian and bike environments. In a lot of the meetings, people were saying that Kōloa and South Kaua'i is awesome, but we would love to be able to walk our kids to school or let our kids bike home from school, but it is just too dangerous; the roadways are way too dangerous, so that kind of rolls into the second highest comment, which had to do with roads, traffic, and that sort of thing. Number three was improving or better maintaining parks and open space in recreational areas. Number four had to do with parking and this may have been a little bit because of the issues of parking on Po'ipū Road that were happening right before we kicked off this project. Number five was commercial uses, which sounds a little vague, but it has more to do with preserving the smaller, "local feel, mom and pop" type establishments in South Kaua'i that make it so special. With that, we tasked our



CAC to start building the vision for South Kaua'i and this was in July of 2013. There they are, busy working. What we did was pulled all of those individual comments into word clouds and we did them for each of the individual towns. If you look at this graphic, what it does is the larger words that stand out were the ones that were more frequently mentioned in the comments. This is for Kōloa. You can see some of the comments. It is just to kind of inspire our CAC to really think about each community and how they may differ, what the issues may be, and what the vision for each one should be. This is Po'ipū and I am going to go really quickly through these. Kalāheo and 'Ōma'o. You can see that "bus" was actually a really big comment that came up for 'Ōma'o, which was very interesting. Lāwa'i. As part of that visioning exercise, we brought Opticos in to start talking about different place types. We started to look at the different planning documents that the County has been working on.

Councilmember Yukimura: Kimi, on your word clouds, just so that I understand what it means, the larger the words means that there were more comments on them?

Ms. Yuen: Yes, that word would come up more frequently in the comments that we collected out of those seven hundred (700) comments.

Councilmember Yukimura: I see. Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: No problem. We started to also look at some of the planning documents that already exists and planning tools to help with growth and development on the island and start to look at which ones really acknowledge that there are different places on the island and recognizing the uniqueness of each. Some of them that do that is your DP and that is the whole purpose of your development plans or community plans, which is to look at a specific region on the island because it may be a little different from its neighbor. The Multimodal Land Transportation Plan that was just done by Charlier, and then to start understanding where some of these conflicts come up whenever development or growth has ever brought up. A lot of the conflict, if you think about it, has to do with the fact that there is entitled land, whether it is zoned Residential, Commercial, or whatnot on the island, but because of the standards that are in your Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, an R-4 district or Residential zoned district in Līhu'e is treated exactly the same way as it is in Hanalei or Kōloa. That is kind of what we are trying to show here is that the documents or planning tools that we have that do not really fully acknowledge those different types of places on Kaua'i. If you look at your State land use map, there are just very general four (4) categories of land use, your General Plan, and zoning. To illustrate that a little, I will use the General Plan as an example. It does a very good job and it is the point to be very broad and general to acknowledge different land uses in agricultural, military, open, park, resort, and transportation, but then it gets a little bit into starting to identify town cores. There were areas identified in the GP Residential Community and urban centers, but then if you zoom in to the General Plan for South Kaua'i, you will see that everything in yellow is basically classified as a residential community, but it is the same yellow or same land use designation in Kalāheo, Lāwa'i, 'Ōma'o, or Kōloa and we all know that all of those areas are very different from each other. What Opticos, our consultants, brought to us that you start recognizing that location matters and this is maybe the start of why there is conflict because there is an existing zoned parcel that is allowed to build to four (4) stories, but that does not fit Kōloa Town, and those are where you see a lot of issues,

which is the building form that is permitted and the landowner or the developer has the right to actually do it based on your existing zoning is not exactly what the community wants or what they want to see in their community. To start recognizing that location matters and that maybe it is time to start looking at a new way of doing zoning to manage development and growth. We look to nature as an example. This is the transect of an ecosystem going from the ocean to inland, water body, but through each of those areas, there are transitions and those spaces are all different as you move from one place to another. Similarly, there have been trends to also apply that concept of transect zones to the built environment, which takes you from what is called a "T-1 zone" or completely natural with the minimal amount of human intrusion or built environment to a much more dense, more built out "T-6 zone," which is the far end of the spectrum here. On Kaua'i, you really do not have that high intensity of urban core as a T-6 zone. That is really something more like Honolulu business district downtown. At most on Kaua'i, Līhu'e might be considered an urban center. Your smaller towns are probably more on the order of a "T-4 zone," but basically the idea is to start recognizing that there are these gradations and transitions between the natural environment and T-1 to your built environments. On the end there are just special districts and that one looks like it is illustrating a typical shopping mall with the big box and parking, but that is just alternative land use that is a little bit outside of the T-zone, so we try to keep to that. As you apply it to an island community and taking examples from the *ahupua'a* where you go from the uplands and mountain areas to your coastal areas and everything in between. The transition should work with each other and it should not be jumping from one to the next.

What we started to do was to start looking at Kaua'i's walkable place types, which is to really help understand what our existing communities look like because the idea is that we are trying to preserve what is special about Kaua'i, our towns, and our communities. To do that, we need to understand where we are today. Opticos took us through some of the classic place types that they saw on Kaua'i, rural crossroads where maybe you have two (2) major roads intersecting a little bit of commercial, like say in Lāwa'i it is the post office, but really nothing else around it. It is still very rural and open. Then you transition to a little more intense development where you have a small town, you start having residences, more business, small village, large village, and then to town. On their range of place types, "town" really is Līhu'e, although I know all of us refer to Kōloa Town as a town. This is just to give you a sense of the scale and the differences in recognizing that in order for us to preserve, maintain, and see going forward that we are consistent with what we have and perpetuating the communities that we all love. You have to understand that there are these differences, they are relationships, and they all play in together.

We took a first cut at starting to do an analysis of the existing towns. This is just a little graphic showing where they started to locate crossroads, maybe at 'Oma'o or Lāwa'i small villages. The larger more intense kind of villages were Kalāheo and Kōloa in orange. Po'ipū was just distributed. That one is tough one because it is a resort district and that may be one of those that you start looking as a special district because of all the resort uses that are there. From there, our CAC members drafted vision statements for each of the communities. For Kōloa, the vision is to "be a thriving commercial and residential community that maintains its rural feel and historic 'old town' charm by preserving, enhancing, and protecting its vast cultural treasures." Po'ipū was recognized as the resort and employment center. The idea here was to create "a world-class, sustainable resort destination serving residents and visitors alike, developed responsibly, with clean, healthy

beaches and ocean environments, welcoming parks and preserving heritage resources, all well-connected and accessible to everyone.” Kalāheo was seen as “remain as a residential community enhanced by a neighborhood-scaled commercial center and supported by small local businesses.” ‘Oma‘o will “maintain its value as a small rural residential community.” They really did not see any change happening twenty (20) years from now for ‘Oma‘o. Similarly with Lāwa‘i, it “will remain a rural crossroads with a limited commercial area centered around the Post Office and Old Cannery.” In whole, we came up with a vision statement for the entire district for South Kaua‘i, which states, “It will be comprised of distinct rural communities,” the idea that each of the communities maintaining its difference and separation from each other was an important point and that is what that is getting at. “Each embracing its own rich cultural, natural, and historic heritage, but well-connected through safe and efficient transportation networks; balanced, responsible development enhances existing communities, preserving the local rural lifestyle that embodies South Kaua‘i and cherished by residents and visitors alike.” We took those vision statements out to the Kōloa Plantation Days in July of 2013, got more feedback, refined them, and from there, we jumped into starting to pull together the community profile and background information. We brought in our consultants that took a look at existing conditions and shared it with our CAC, which happened over a couple of days. Then we had a big public event where we started to do open design charrettes with the community and had walk audits of Kōloa and Kalāheo. This is an example. I am just going to flip through some of these photos, but just to give you an idea...it was a good mix. We had folks from our CAC of course, as well as just members from the general community that decided to join us on these walk audits. We had some County department and agency staff and department heads there on various parts of the walk audits. Kalāheo Town started at Papalina and the highway. As you can see, we did a circuit around. Really, the goal of doing this is to start calibrating your design standards to the actual places that you are planning for. Part of that discussion is, like I was mentioning earlier, your zoning code is for the entire island. It does not recognize that each residentially zoned area may be different between the different communities. What we start to do when we do these walk audits is to actually go out there physically, measure the distance between buildings, how far our houses setback from the roadway, how wide are your sidewalks, and that sort of thing, so that we can actually start generating design guidelines that are calibrated to your existing communities so future developments will be built to those new standards and will match what you already have, so you will not have that clash of, “Well, I am following the zoning code. I am legally allowed to build up to five (5) to ten (10) feet to the roadway.” But when you plop it into the middle of Kōloa Town, which had ten (10) to twenty (20) feet setbacks for their houses, it starts to change the feel of the community and that is where you start getting pushback from residents that say, “I do not want this next to my house.” The idea is to create new design standards that are calibrated and specific to each community so that future development and future growth matches what you have and it is fair to the developers and landowners because now they know what they are building for. These are just some photos and I am going to just go real quick through Kōloa’s walk audit. After each walk audit, we came back, broke into small groups, and started talking about what we saw, what made each area unique, and had each group do a little presentation on what they saw and what they felt was important to try to capture and preserve in terms of each community. I do not know how they did this, but Opticos at the end of all of that had an open design studio two (2) days later, and while they were busy drawing street sections, and trying to capture all of that information we gathered on the walk audits, we had a Po‘ipū open house event where we invited the public again to come. The County Planning Department had

just wrapped up its Po'ipū Road charrette, so we had a lot of those maps up and the preliminary designs for that and people got to provide input on those as well. Here are some pictures of how we started to try to capture the existing feel and character of our existing towns, and then how we could preserve them moving forward with new design standards. At the end of it, there was a presentation to share all that was developed.

Over the next roughly eight (8) months, there was additional community outreach. Kōloa Community Association in January of 2014 was happening at the same time we started developing the draft alternatives for the plan. We went out again at the Kōloa Plantation Days and I think this was maybe the first time we had some actual land use and multimodal transportation maps and the alternatives for people to comment on. We went out during the County Farm Fair in August again and also had displays up at the Kapule Bulding with the Planning Department and had a box where people could drop their comments as well. There were Kōloa and Kalāheo open house events in September and October of 2014, right before we went before the Planning Commission to seek their input and approval. With the Planning Commission, we started off with the workshop that was held in September, and then had three (3) subsequent Planning Commission hearings on October 14, 2014 and October 28, 2014, and then on November 15, 2014, we had the final one where the plan was approved with revisions. That is the version of the document that you have before you. It is the Planning Commission approved version. Now, we are going to dive into the plan itself. Are there any other questions? I guess I will stop just on the process.

Committee Chair Chock: It is a lot. What I would like to do is move us...we have about ten (10) more minutes before...what I need to do is take a break for lunch for our staff and we can pick up right there. I think it will also give us time to kind of digest everything that you have shared so far. Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: Great. Thank you. You want to keep going?  
I am sorry.

Committee Chair Chock: Yes, let us go until 12:30 p.m.

Ms. Yuen: Okay. You can just interrupt me, Committee Chair, as you need to. The organization of the Draft Community Plan is broken down into seven (7) chapters. The first is the introduction and kind of the background processes that we went through today. Chapter 2 focuses in on the community vision and vision statements that were developed. Chapter 3 is in a bridge version of the community profile and you are really talking about existing conditions, so it is a snapshot of all the background information that we collected and put into the much larger two hundred (200) plus page report. Chapter 4 starts to then develop the policies and guidelines for future conditions; moving forward, "What do we want to look like in 2035?" Chapter 5 is just an introduction of the "form-based code." The form-based code that was generated actually resides in the appendix and we will go over that a little bit later. Chapter 6 is the implementation and monitoring. Chapter 7 is our references. Marie, feel free to jump in because I know this is your slide. Just to give an understanding of how the plan works, we start of course with the vision statements. That is really what we want to be in twenty (20) years. Everything falls from that. You have chapters 4 through 6 with the policies and guidelines that include transportation and land use maps. Then the form-based code, like I mentioned, resides in Appendix C because it is much more detailed. What that does is with those vision statements, policies, and

guidelines for the future of South Kauaʻi, it filters then down into being able to direct County projects, which involve your six (6) year Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Annual Budget. When we met with the department heads, they started to realize that, “Hey, if we have this plan laid out for the next twenty (20) years, we understand what the community wants for each of those areas. We can start directing, focusing, and being proactive about those County improvements, whether it is roadways, water, sewer, etcetera, because now we know where growth is expected to happen.” For them it was, like I said, being able to be and think proactively rather than reactively. The future zoning actions— I think it does not list here, but part of the current Bill is to adopt three (3) of the Special Planning Areas (SPA) where the form-based code will actually be applied, but in future zoning actions, this goes into three (3) other areas where we have identified future potential areas where it makes sense to have a walkable mixed-use community and where form-based code would be applied. It also looks at other uses that we were recommending as part of the land use plan, so Agricultural to Industrial, R-6 to Agricultural, and I will go into each of these later in the presentation, but this is just a summary of those future zoning actions, that it would not be part of the current Bill. Like I said, the special planning areas are really only three (3) discreet areas in South Kauaʻi, which is the Poʻipū roundabout, Kōloa, and Kalāheo Towns. You will see the boundaries of those areas of where the form-based code would be applied.

The plan components, when you look at the policies and guidelines, we took a “broad-brush” approach. The big topic is what we are going to focus on today with really what has to do with the land use and your transportation networks, but the plan does go into natural and cultural heritage resources, and that was actually a big basis for developing the plan, and I will explain that as we go through the land uses. Walkable mixed-use communities of course and your parks and recreation, but also looking at your economic drivers like agriculture, industrial, and resort and tourism, as well as the “nitty-gritty” infrastructure and public facility needs and economic development in general.

If you can remember from the beginning of my presentation, we talked about those growth projections. This is how we came to understand what we needed to plan for and accommodate in the South Kauaʻi District. The top line is your 2010 population for the planning district. Just for South Kauaʻi, it was about one thousand seven hundred (1,700). The projected population was just under seventeen thousand (17,000) for 2035. That translated into eight thousand three hundred (8,300) total housing units in the districts. What we did from there is we took an inventory of the existing housing units, which was five thousand eight hundred (5,800); we took that out. Then you are left with two thousand five hundred (2,500) additional housing units to accommodate in South Kauaʻi based on the 2035 projections. Understanding from now until 2035, the idea is to accommodate two hundred five hundred (2,500) additional housing units. Then we took another closer look at some of the existing areas and there are areas that are already zoned. Those are unbuilt units that could also accommodate some of that growth, so we took that out as well. There is another one thousand (1,000) residential units and we excluded everything that was within a Visitor Destination Area (VDA) because the idea is that that probably will not be satisfying your primary residential needs that may go to vacation or second homes. The idea was to not count those, but even so, you still had existing vacant residential zoning that could accommodate about one thousand (1,000) units. In end, what we were really left with was the one thousand five hundred (1,500) housing units to allocate within South Kauaʻi. There was discussion through a lot of our CAC meetings that there is

a longstanding State residentially zoned parcel of about sixty (60) acres that runs about half the length of Ala Kinoiki, the eastern bypass road. The thought was that if we are really trying to preserve distinction between our communities; if you imagine that built out, you would really start to see Kōloa and Po'ipū blending together. What would happen if we downzoned that from Residential to Agricultural, we would need to accommodate another three hundred sixty (360) units based on its existing zoning of R-6 and sixty (60) acres, so you just do the simple math of multiplying it because in R-6 you are allowed six (6) units per acre. That was thrown in. We checked with the State about this. They actually currently have a long-term lease on that parcel for the next I think twenty (20) years. It took us almost to our planning horizon of 2035, and it is going to stay in Agricultural anyway, so the thought was that if the State does not have any plans to actually develop that out, maybe we should shift that to Agricultural. Again, adjusting our ultimate number of housing units that we would need to accommodate in terms of future growth until 2035 is one thousand eight hundred sixty (1,860). We went back and forth and started off with some preliminary ideas about where growth should be allocated within South Kaua'i and what our CAC and our teamwork came down to was basically...I will explain a little bit more in a little bit more detail what this homestead line item is, but basically, you are looking at existing State land use...it is Agricultural State land use properties that were allowed to build a single-family home before we were even a state, so this is the Land Act of 1895. Basically, it provides those landowners to build a single-family house and that exists quite a bit on this island, actually, the homestead communities, but we did not really see much more of the future growth coming from there, so we allocated about five percent (5%) of the future growth to homestead. You will see the bulk of the growth was allocated to what we are calling the "Po'ipū Gateway Mixed-Use Village." It is about one thousand one hundred (1,100) units and we will go into detail about why that is, but the idea is that if we are trying to minimize impacts to our infrastructure, whether it is your roadways, water, sewer, and all of that, you locate your future residences close to where your employment sectors are. The idea is that the Po'ipū Gateway Mixed-Use Village is located right adjacent to the Po'ipū resort district. Our CAC and our team allocated sixty percent (60%) of the future growth for that area. Numila is actually an existing State land use Urban and R-6 zoned area on the west side of the planning district. We did not change any allocation to that. We just assumed that it would build out to its existing zoning potential, which are one hundred fifty (150) units. We took a look with Opticos at existing Kōloa and Kalāheo Town and trying to understand what each community could really accommodate. We recognized that the infrastructure there in Kalāheo is very limited. It does not have sewer connections and the traffic there is already bad. Really, we only allocated fifty (50) additional units to Kalāheo Town, and then Kōloa Town because of the mix of uses there we have allocated about four hundred fifty (450) units there.

Committee Chair Chock: We can probably take a break here. It is 12:30 p.m. We will come back at 1:30 p.m. and continue our discussion. I am sure we will have a lot more questions at the end of the day. I want to thank everyone for being here. I know that are a lot of people here to testify. I am sorry that our discussion on the Department of Transportation (DOT) thing went a little bit longer than we wanted to. We wanted to get to public testimony before lunch, but if you could hang in there with us because we still need to hear from you. I think we probably have about thirty (30) more minutes in this presentation I am guessing. Again, we need your input. We will see you back at 1:30 p.m.

There being no objections, the meeting recessed at 12:32 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 1:31 p.m., and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: *Aloha* and welcome back from lunch. We are continuing with our presentation of the South Kaua'i plan. Ms. Yuen, please continue.

Ms. Yuen: Thank you, Chair Chock. The slide we left off with before we broke for lunch— we had gotten through the population growth projection for South Kaua'i and the additional residential units we were looking to accommodate in South Kaua'i as one thousand eight hundred sixty (1,860). The area that we have outlined in yellow on this table is the breakdown, and we went through that as well. If we start looking at our district as a whole, this is the same table again outlined in yellow on this graph; same numbers, same percentages. We really started to look at this future land use allocation and growth projections based on the transportation networks. The reason being is that traffic is always on the top of everyone's mind. As you heard from this morning, traffic is really becoming bad along the highway. What we thought would be a good way to approach not only the land use alternatives, but also the transportation alternatives, was to integrate the two. What we did was we started looking at this integrated with what is called "Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ)" and these are the same areas that were used in the State DOT's recent update, and I think you heard a bit of it this morning for the Kaua'i Islandwide Long-Range Plan for their transportation networks. It is the exact same traffic analysis zones and what they do is look at residences, as well as jobs, and looking at them as send and receive zones basically for traffic. That is why they are a little bit not necessarily equal in size and that sort of thing. It is basically identifying different send and receive zones and that is basically what the State DOT used in their traffic model and we used the exact same model, and we gave that to our transportation engineers as the basis for the South Kaua'i transportation and traffic analysis. Just to give you a little flavor of what this involved, this is Kalāheo Town where we started looking at the core of Kalāheo Town and the coloring has to do with the draft "T-zones," the transect zones that we started allocating. Of course the darker the purple, the more intense mixed use; that is like your town core right at the intersection of Papalina and Kaumuali'i, and then it radiates out and blends to less dense transect zones like T-3 Village Edge, which is that "VN," is kind of the idea. "Edge"— I think T-3 E is really you are looking at single-family residential. The transition from the town core outwards is kind of that purple gradation, and then what we started to do was literally breakdown those growth projections for housing units by TAZ zones, so that our transportation model made sense and was in sync with the land use proposals or actually the land use designations. That is Kalāheo Town. This is Kōloa. Similarly, you can see that the four hundred fifty-one (451) total units that we needed to allocate to Kōloa Town, we broke it down based on the TAZ zones. What that brought us to was the overall distribution of the projected growth. During our meetings, we talked about walkable mixed-use communities at our town cores, so that people do not have to drive. I am really having the land use map built off of protecting the sensitive natural resources, and then also acknowledging things that have been going on in the past; land uses like the homesteads that are already entitled to the single-family, as well as things that have been going on with your agricultural lands, Important Agricultural Lands (IAL) designations on quite of bit of agricultural land in South Kaua'i. Just briefly, I will go through the different land use categories that we have on the map. The darkest green is your natural areas. This is your T-1 areas that you really would not see any kind of development or very minimal human intervention, which includes your State Land Use



Conservation Districts, critical habitats, any kind of forest reserves, and that sort of thing. The light green—there are two (2) types of light green that you see, which is hard to see in this projected version, but that is basically your agricultural lands. There is horizontal hatching on the areas that are already designated as important agricultural lands or IAL. We thought it was important for the map to show that as well, so it becomes this “one-stop shop” almost like in terms of regulatory things that are impacting the area. The homesteads that we talked about...

Committee Chair Chock: You have a clarifying question.

Ms. Yuen: Yes?

Councilmember Yukimura: How are you designating the IAL?

Ms. Yuen: The IAL has a horizontal white stripe going across it, so it is really hard to see. Basically, Alexander & Baldwin (A&B) had designated almost all of this area...actually that is all the area as IAL. The interior valley of Māhā‘ulepū is IAL. I think there are more. It includes Waitā and a little bit in here. Those are the big areas of IAL. I do not know if your printed maps help you. We do have the land use map printed big, but I do not know if it is coming out any better.

Mr. Dahilig: Councilmember, I just want to clarify that this was something that was done by the Land Use Commission in a previous decision order some years ago. This is not a proposal.

Ms. Yuen: Yes, that is existing, already designating IAL maps.

Councilmember Yukimura: I understood that. I just wanted to know how you could see it.

Ms. Yuen: Yes, I am sorry. The projected map is hard to see. We will have zoom-ins and hopefully they project better.

Councilmember Yukimura: It is in the plan itself?

Ms. Yuen: It is in the plan itself. If you look on the legend on the top...

Councilmember Yukimura: It is much better.

Ms. Yuen: Yes, I am sorry. We will have zoom-in maps, so hopefully that hatching will come up a little better.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: Sure. The area that you see in this tan kind of scattered throughout are the residential land use designations, and then the homestead areas that are State Agricultural Land Use, but they are allowed to build a single-family home dwelling, are hatched with the little red stripe. Those areas are all homestead designated and agricultural State land use.

Councilmember Yukimura: At what density?

Ms. Yuen: I think it is one (1) unit per lot of record as of 1976. A lot of it is built out already, but we thought maybe you might be able to accommodate five percent (5%) of the future growth in the remaining lots. I think that is the basis.

Councilmember Yukimura: It is already entitled?

Ms. Yuen: Yes, so it is more like as a reference for the Planning Department if a proposal comes through and you can easily see on our land use map that it is one of the homestead parcels. It is taken from the actual homestead maps, so that is the basis of the area designation. The pink areas mainly along the coast are your resort land use designations. Basically, we colored anything that was in an existing VDA in pink, as well as added Makahuena Point since that one has already gone through permits and approval and they had requested to be in the VDA, and then we added a few along Lāwa'i Road that wanted to be in the VDA. Again, to the Planning Commission, we clarified that the Ho'ona Neighborhood where a lot of people were testifying about wanting to preserve that as a primary residential; we did leave it as a residential, so that is what you see on that map. We also outlined the Kukui'ula Project because technically while they have a total of one thousand five hundred (1,500) units approved, only half are supposed to be visitor units. We thought it would be helpful to show the full extent of the project area, but because they do not know where those seven hundred fifty (750) visitor units would be, we left it more general. The area we show in pink, I believe, is around their clubhouse facilities. There is a pocket of industrial along the Old Kōloa Mill site. The area on the western side is actually the photovoltaic (PV) farm that has been built there. The mill itself is here and we thought to support all of the agricultural land that is in the district, you would probably need some kind of agricultural processing. There really is very, very little industrial zoned lands. I think there is a little up in Lāwa'i, but it makes sense to locate your processing close to your agricultural lands. Then as we start looking at the areas of the walkable town cores and identifying those, we outlined them in purple. The scale of this map is not well to read up on the screen. The three (3) areas where we are recommending the form-based code go would be Kōloa Town, Kalāheo Town, and the existing area around the Po'ipū roundabout, just because of a lot of recent input that we have been getting from the community at the time that we kicked this off. That roundabout has become a community symbol. It is kind of iconic. People recognize it and people love it. They want to keep it as kind of this gateway to Po'ipū and to try to preserve the feel and the look of that. We thought that might be another place where form-based code would be good to implement.

Three (3) other areas where walkable mixed-use communities were envisioned—one of them has to do with the major growth allocation of the one thousand one hundred (1,100) units in the Po'ipū Gateway, which is again like I was mentioning, right adjacent to your major resort destination, so people who live here can easily get to work. The idea is that none of that would be in the VDA. It is all primary residential and it would include a variety of densities, but the idea is that future village core should have affordability of your workforce housing to support to adjacent resort areas. A second area that came up through our CAC meetings was the Lāwa'i Cannery area. That already has some commercial going on there. The zoning is a little funky and it is a project development of sorts, but the idea was that that area along Kōloa Road and Lāwa'i Town has the potential to become a cute, little mixed-use town core in Lāwa'i. The third one for future

consideration is the Numila where about one hundred fifty (150) units were allocated. Again, just to flashback and show you what the 1978 development plan looked like, we will zoom in to some of these areas. I do not know if you can see the hatching any better on the IAL on the slide. I did also want to point out that on the land use map we do identify all the exceptional trees in the district. If you look right in Kōloa Town, you have a lot of those exceptional monkeypods that have already been designated. There was a recommendation to actually create an exceptional tree lane as part of Kōloa Road that goes right through Kōloa Town. That is what those indication and those markers are.

Councilmember Yukimura: Can you just repeat that?

Ms. Yuen: The exceptional tree lane or the exceptional trees?

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, what you just said about the proposal to...

Ms. Yuen: Yes, there was a recommendation that came through our meetings about...you have the six (6) monkeypods actually identified, but maybe it needs to be anything along Kōloa Road and Po'ipū right in the core, basically within this town core if you have a significant monkeypod on any of those roads in the town core of Kōloa that we should really consider them exceptional because it really adds...that is a huge part of the character of Kōloa Town. That was the recommendation that came out.

Committee Chair Chock: Can I ask that you turn off your cell phones, please? Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: To continue, in your draft ordinance, you have the SPAs or Special Planning Areas actually designated. "H" is Kōloa Town, "J" is the Po'ipū roundabout, and then the future SPA at the Po'ipū Gateway is about one hundred eighty-five (185) acres. I know in earlier testimony, there were questions about, "How big is that? What kind of density does that kind of look like?" If you allocate the one thousand one hundred (1,100) units to the one hundred eighty-five (185), it averages out to about an R-6 residential if you developed it all with the same density. If you think about it, it is no denser than a single-family residential at its face, but the idea is that you would probably have a village center where you would have mixed-use commercial and retail. It does not have to be much higher density, but higher density residential units, workforce housing in the town core, kind of at the crossroads of Ala Kinoiki, and maybe offset from Po'ipū Road, but not too far from it because the idea is that you want your future village center to be close to your resort and make it walkable for the entire area. If you have that core with a little bit higher density, what that allows is at the edges for the density to become much less dense. The idea is that you would respect Weliweli Tract, which is an R-4, and along this edge maybe put a similar density; if not, less dense. Similarly, on the edges as you bleed out towards the agricultural lands, you would have larger single-family house lots and that sort of thing, and that your core higher density would be close to where your major road and infrastructure and your employment centers are. We mentioned that there was an R-6 state-owned parcel that was being recommended to be downzoned. It is right there and it actually is this very long linear piece that extends basically Weliweli Tract. It is an R-6 and it was envisioned originally as affordable housing, but was never built and now the State has a long-term agricultural lease on it right

now. So even almost to our planning horizon, it is slated to be agricultural. The idea was that imagine if this was all single-family residences, when you are driving down Ala Kinoiki to or from, you really would start to feel Po'ipū (inaudible) with Kōloa, but if you pull that out and leave it as agricultural land, you have this nice gap that keeps those view planes open.

Going to our more rural communities of Kalāheo, Lāwa'i, and 'Ōma'o, this is the previous plan. This is a zoom-in of the land use map for those areas. Similarly, on your draft bill, you have SPA "I," which is Kalāheo Town, and then two (2) future SPAs: Numila is about forty-five (45) acres and the Lāwa'i Cannery one is about sixteen (16) acres. They are not really big designations and they are conceptual in nature, so the boundaries of these future SPAs are still rough at this point and subject to change. The idea is that the future SPAs would still need to go through the full master planning effort and if there are land use entitlements like if it is in State land use agricultural, you would still need to change that to urban and it would still need to go through zoning. There are still quite a few steps before the future SPA designated areas would become any kind of development project *per se*, but the idea is to start designating them and recognizing them as the future walkable mixed-use communities for South Kaua'i. We also wanted to point out that through our discussions, A&B had brought to our attention that they were starting to master plan the far southwestern corner of our planning district and it is about four hundred twenty-five (425) acres, but the thought is that it is a future community that was tied more to Port Allen. It is currently agricultural lands that are outside of the IAL designation, but we did not allocate any projected growth from our district to it because the idea was that that would relate more to the Port Allen community and it was really because of that boundary change between the planning districts that this actually ended up in South Kaua'i instead of Hanapēpē and 'Ele'ele as a community plan update. The idea is that we would identify it just as a rough bubble as a conditional future growth area and it is all related and based on the projections and the processes that come out through the Hanapēpē and 'Ele'ele community plan update. For right now, it is just kind of a note on the map. We do not allocate any growth from South Kaua'i to that area. We just did not feel like to be able to connect to that infrastructure wise, roadway wise made sense. It makes much more sense for it to connect to Hanapēpē and 'Ele'ele. Again, here is a zoom-in of the Ho'ona residential neighborhood that would remain residential land use. This is a little zoom-in of the industrial area centered around the Old Kōloa Mill site. It is in total of about one hundred sixty-three (163) acres, but that includes sixty-seven (67) acres of the PV energy farm. There was one area where we considered future resort growth. If you look at the projections and if you look at the table that we showed earlier, South Kaua'i really has your primary resort destination and the thought was, "Well, there was some projection for growth." We put it to our CAC to see if there were any areas that made sense to have future resort growth and what we came out with was a small thirteen (13) acre parcel wedged between Po'ipū Bay Golf Course and the more sensitive coastal areas. Currently, it is not in use. It was the former nursery site for the golf course, but the idea was that it would be a (inaudible) and it is adjacent to the Grand Hyatt, so any kind of future resort growth would not expand past that because you have the golf course already, but you are still close enough to the existing resort community. Through the Planning Commission process, we went over the numbers and the projections and how we came to that, and they felt that it made more sense to at least...

Committee Chair Chock: We need to take a short break to change our tape. We will also take a caption break, too. We will back in twelve (12) minutes. Thank you.

There being no objections, the meeting recessed at 1:53 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 2:05 p.m., and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: We are back from our caption break. Ms. Yuen, may you continue with your presentation? Thank you so much. But first, you have a question.

Councilmember Kagawa: We said that there would be about sixty (60) minutes or ninety (90) minutes and I think we have reached ninety (90) minutes already, but I just kind of want to get to a point where if you can try and “hurry up” and get the public to speak because I think a lot of the public knows what they want to say and they want to give us their message, and then we can come back here later. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. On the break, we discussed that and we think that it is going to take twenty (20) more minutes for this presentation, and then it will be followed directly by public testimony. Please continue. Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: Thank you, Chair Chock. To continue with the discussion that we left off with, the area we were talking about was an area that was originally designated as potential resort growth, but through the Planning Commission process, it was changed back to agricultural land, so that is what you see in the current version of the plan. The main reason was because the visitor unit projections were very close to what could possibly be accommodated through proposed projects, which means that they were entitled, but not yet built. On the bottom of this slide, you can see that there are quite a few projects that are on the books, but not built out, so whether those come to fruition or not is yet to be seen. The idea is to recognize that, but for now, leave it in agricultural land use designation.

Councilmember Yukimura: I have a question. On the previous slide in the very last sentence, what is a “VPI?”

Ms. Yuen: That is the “Visitor Plant Inventory,” so the State keeps track of all the different type of visitor units. Whether they are hotels, timeshares, or the small “mom and pop” bed and breakfast types...

Councilmember Yukimura: I am sorry, I see that you explained it above. I did not catch it. Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: No problem. It is a broad inventory basically that tries to track any type of existing visitor units. That is where those numbers came from. That is the land use map. Heading now towards our transportation studies—we were very fortunate, and I said this from the get-go, that there has been a lot of work that has been done already in South Kauaʻi, so kudos to the Planning Department and your other agencies for already being on top of a lot of this. We tried to incorporate and integrate all of those findings into what we are recommending in the South Kauaʻi plan. Whether it was the Kōloa-Poʻipū area

circulation plan done by Charlier in 2007, the Islandwide Multimodal Land Transportation Plan in 2012, the one you just talked about, your State DOT Long-Range Land Transportation Plan that was just done in 2014; your other departments have also been active in doing these things. Public Works had done a road inventory that we used, and then a sidewalk survey was done by the Planning Department. There was that recently completed Po'ipū Road Charrette that happened right before this project kicked off. I know Public Works in conjunction with the Planning Department is looking at updating your street standards, so that is what that living streets standard is about. I am sorry—that is the slide from the Po'ipū Road Charrette. Also, your Transportation Agency has been doing their part as well and they shared with us their bus shelter survey and their findings. All of those previous reports and ongoing efforts are really being integrated into what is being proposed in the South Kaua'i plan. Just to give you some background information on existing traffic, this data is pulled from that State Department of Transportation study. Just looking at this, the road segments in red are the ones that are exceeding their volume to capacity ratio and it is done as a regional roadway model, so we talked about the TAZ zones and all of that. All of this is the result of those previous traffic studies and it is showing where your roads are getting stressed. If you look within the South Shore, really in the core of Kōloa, all the roads are still blue, which is this level of service of "C" or better, so they are doing alright. Even in projected 2035 traffic, the State found that really your highway starts to get a little tougher. Kalāheo was already in red, but the areas to 'Oma'o are getting worse. Again, you have to look at this—this is not about intersection analysis, which typical transportation impact studies are based on; this is a regional roadway, so it is based on the number of lanes, intersections, and that sort of thing for through traffic. That is the projected traffic and how the roadways are doing.

We had our traffic engineers—really, I call them transportation engineers because they were not only looking at traffic. The first step is always to see how your existing roadways are doing and they looked at the peak hours. This graphic is showing your "a.m." or morning peak hour. The roadways in green average speed are forty (40) to fifty (50) miles an hour. As it gets red, it is much slower, so that would be the indication of where your roadways may be failing. This is the morning. This is the afternoon peak hour. Based on this live data, which they collected, it is showing that the roadways are actually having... they are not stressed as badly as we thought they might be. A key finding that came out of the traffic study was that seventy percent (70%) of peak hour traffic on Kaumuali'i Highway through Kalāheo Town is through traffic. It does not start or end in South Kaua'i and it is likely west side commuters going to and from Līhu'e or areas further east or north for work. If anybody knows what Kalāheo Town is, and I know some of the long-range plans for the roadways is to widen the highway to four (4) lanes—you can imagine what that would do to Kalāheo Town where a lot of the buildings and shops are right up on the street. It would completely change that neighborhood. What we challenged our transportation engineers to do was to see, "Can we maintain our roadways as two (2) lane roadways and stick to the goals of that Multimodal Land Transportation Plan where it did not want vehicle miles traveled to increase going forward, but to do the modal shift; shift what you can to public transits or buses, and shift people to walk or bike as well?" What we did was develop a multimodal roadway network where the pedestrian facilities are shown in green, the bike facilities are shown in blue, and then the red are the roadways we challenged our transportation engineers to maintain as two (2) lane roadways. If you think about it, your roadways are really the way people experience places, either driving or walking, and to change any of those roadways from two (2) lanes to

four (4) lanes or something that is very car-centric would really change your communities. I am not going to go into detail about this, but there are recommendations for roundabouts along Po'ipū Road that came up through the Po'ipū Road Charrette. Another thought was that if that western bypass could get connected up, even have another opportunity for a gateway feature with another roundabout at the intersection of Maluhia before you come into Kōloa Town— this is Kōloa Road, Maluhia, and then Po'ipū Road. That whole experience changes because now people realize, "Hey, we are coming to Kōloa Town. It is time to slow down." Those are the kinds of things that we included. We heard from folks in Weliweli Tract that they want the intersection at Kipuka, so little things like that. There are intersection improvements in the green squares, roundabouts in the red circles, and again the different facilities.

We took it a step further in Kōloa Town and actually started looking at conceptual street designs. Some of these had a lot of feedback, whether it should be reverse-in or front end angled parking. The green that you see on these conceptual plans are bike lanes and the parking obviously on the street. This is Kalāheo Town, another conceptual plan to try to improve the main intersection in Kalāheo Town and how to make it safer for bikes and pedestrians, but then also still accommodate your vehicles. We came up with conceptual street sections for certain stretches of existing roadways. This is Kōloa Town and what it could look like if you actually provide nice, wide sidewalks, on-street parking with street trees, and then allow for bikes either through maybe shared use... some places you would have an actual bike lane. This is Kalāheo Town, kind of a perspective drawing of what that could look like on the highway. Hoowili Road, which is the road that runs between the *heiau* and Manokalanipō Park. The idea was that we start recommending landscaping that makes sense in that area, so marrying the native Loulu Palm and the street tree that they have been planting at the *heiau* as well. Another layer to this is to really start to think about making your infrastructure do multiple things. In addition to making it safer for pedestrians and bikes and also accommodating your vehicles, start looking at doing green infrastructure where your landscape strips are actually collecting storm water runoff and filtering it before it hits our oceans and beaches. Similarly in Kalāheo Town, we have bioswales in the roadways. This was the proposal for the transit network, which is very similar to what was recommended in the Charlier plan. The only change was that we added a stop that went through 'Oma'o Town.

Other recommendations for transit had to do with relating to the key finding that a lot of the highway traffic going through South Kaua'i is actually through traffic, so to really reemphasize the need to "beef-up" your transit service. Right now, the bus service to west side only comes every hour. What happens if you make it every fifteen (15) minutes? People on the west side realize, "Hey, it is not going to be that bad if I miss one bus. In fifteen (15) minutes, I can wait for the next one." That would encourage people to use transit. Also, for getting people to our district as one of the major resort areas on the island, coordinate those schedules with employee shift schedules to really cater it to make it convenient to people.

Just flipping through some other slides, like I said, our plan covers a broad range of topics and I am not going to go into detail here, but water resources and natural resources. We even looked at emergency evacuation plans and the updated tsunami evacuation zones. That brings us to our Draft Form-Based Code for South Kaua'i. If you recall, we did that exercise where we took a look at existing communities and tried to understand that different types of place types that are there. What Opticos had done for us was to translate that into South Kaua'i



Specific Transect Zones, so it ranges. As I said, the full transect zone goes from the natural, T-1, to rural and agriculture, which is T-2, through more urban, which maybe is a T-5 in Līhu'e Town. For South Kaua'i, they really felt that the range of walkable place types exist only in the T-3 to T-4 zone. If you think about it, your town cores would be the village center...the higher its intensity. The general is kind of the transition zone and your edge is kind of your outer edges which transitions to your existing single-family type residences. They created a matrix to explain the different kind of elements that we would start looking at, and again, if you remember we did those walk audits where we are calibrating basically the future design standards for these transect zones to match what is already there because the idea is that you want to continue the existing character that exists in a place and preserve that. Any new project or proposal that is within these areas would have to meet these standards and will therefore fit well into the context of its surrounding community. I am going to flip through these real quick. We are not going to go into detail about all the different transect zones, but the idea is that the darker purple is your village centers; your highest intensity or most diverse mix of uses. This is the Kalāheo SPA or Special Planning Area. Kōloa, similarly as you would expect along the major core roadways with more intensity. Transect zones would be there and then you bleed out right in the yellows to your T-3 zones. This is the Po'ipū roundabout transect zones.

Just to give you a flavor of what the form-based code looks like compared to your typical zoning ordinance, which is mostly text; the form-based code really is visual. It is giving you graphic, as well as kind of quick table references in how to read this and apply it to a project. You have building types, the typical standard building heights and setbacks, where parking is appropriate on a lot and where it is not. They did include land use tables, which for now are pretty similar to your existing zoning within these areas, but then there is one or two that are trying to incorporate more mixed uses. Again, this is more of the land use table. One thing that is different, and really, it took me a total mind shift, going from a typical Euclidean zoning, which is based on land use. What a form-based code does is identifies specific building types there also permitted and anything that does not fall in one of these building types would not be permitted. So it is a totally different way to think about zoning or how you regulate development. The idea is that there is specific building types that are described in the form-based code and only certain ones would be allowed in the different transect zones. Similarly, you have civic spaces, which are your parks and open spaces, and then there is also a section on specific streets and thoroughfares for those projects that are large enough to require a subdivision or where new public streets would be built. This is a little different from what we were talking about earlier with the conceptual site plans and that this would be for any kind of new development that would require new roadways to be built. Just to summarize some of the revisions that came out of our Planning Commission, we preserved Ho'ona Road neighborhood as residential. We had a lot of input from Mālama Māhā'ulepū and we also had a CAC member who was from there. All throughout, we had a lot of good input from them and through the Planning Commission process, we also continue to add more information about Māhā'ulepū and the vision for that area. We deleted the thirteen (13) acre resort expansion by the Grand Hyatt for now and left it in agricultural use, and then we did tweak the Multimodal Transportation Plan with some things that came up, such as the concern over the Lopaka Paipa Boulevard intersection with the western bypass or Ala Kalanikaumaka and really making sure that that intersection includes safe sidewalks and traffic calming issues. Also, like I mentioned earlier, the Kipuka Street, which is the Weliweli Tract intersection to Po'ipū Road, adding another need for intersection improvements for safe crossings there. I am going to

turn over the last three (3) slides to Marie, which is the implementation and next steps. I thank you all for your patience.

MARIE WILLIAMS, Long-Range Planner: Thank you, Kimi. I can actually fly through the section given that we surpassed our allotted time. Kimi did such a great job explaining how we were going to implement this plan, but implementation is found in Chapter 6. As you can imagine, it is probably one of the most important chapters because these plans do not implement themselves and we will have to work together as a County: the Planning Department, other agencies, the Council, and with the stakeholders in the private sector if we want to achieve this vision of managed growth and be proactive, rather than reactive. I know there are definitely some things that we have to react to as well. The good news is that a big chunk of implementation will occur in concert with approval of this plan through adoption of the three (3) special planning areas. This is important because what this means is that day one, when this plan is signed and approved, all development in the allotted special planning areas of Kōloa, Kalāheo, and the Po'ipū roundabout will conform to our new form-based code standards, meaning that it will support the more mixed-use, walkable, vibrant town center with adequate civic space and our improved thoroughfare standards as well. So this was a critical part of getting the vision from up there high in the clouds down to the ground. The other zoning amendments such as those related to the Po'ipū Gateway—I know that is getting a lot of attention. Each of these will follow its own...it would be an action in and of itself, meaning there are a lot more hoops that have to be jumped through. The good news is that there will be more opportunity for public input as these plans come to fruition and are refined; and not just having to do with zoning amendments, but this plan supports new capital projects and we will work through the six (6) year CIP process to align those priorities with the overall annual budget as much as we can. There are other actions that this plan supports and in some cases, this plan will simply be a guide used to guide other County agency action or their plans as well. In Chapter 6, table 6-2, we have a proposed action plan by County agency and then your term, the midterm, and the long-term, and a big part of implementation will occur—well, not a big part, but a lot of this will be fed into our General Plan Update, which is starting very soon. We anticipate starting the public process this summer, in fact. You have the list right here. I will not read through it of what has been completed to-date and what is next of course is this review process, and then the implementation of the plan. When the plan is approved, the work does not end and integration with the General Plan and alignment with our six (6) year Capital Improvements Program report. We also plan on doing annual progress reports to the Planning Commission as well to keep track of the trends and insure that we are progressing towards our goals. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: I appreciate the time and energy that you put into the plan, as well as the presentation. I will ask that you folks vacate for now, but if you could hang around because we will be back for some questions and answers. At this time, I would like to move to public testimony. How many speakers do we have signed up? Seventeen (17). Yes, we will be here for a while. Before I call the first testifier up, there is one thing that I wanted to make sure we can do to be more efficient and that is that what we are talking about today is the plan, the South Kaua'i Community Plan. As a guide for us into the future, I would like to make sure that we can keep our testimony focused as much as possible to any specific request that you have towards the plan. I know that there are many people in the audience that are passionate about the dairy issue, which is an important issue. What I would like to make sure we do not get too far off on a tangent are the pros and cons of that, but if you can apply it to what the plan has to

offer or the direction of the plan, that is where I would like to accept your testimony. Is that okay? Okay. May I have the first registered speaker?

CODIE K. YAMAUCHI, Council Services Assistant I: The first registered speaker is Maya Von Geldern, followed by Bob Williams.

Committee Chair Chock: Maya is not present. May I have the next speaker?

Ms. Yamauchi: The next speaker is Bob Williams, followed by Julie Souza.

Committee Chair Chock: Mr. Williams.

BOB WILLIAMS: I am Bob Williams. I am from Hood River, Oregon. I have been visiting Kaua'i with my wife and family since 1979. In 1979, everybody here remembers how it was then. It is not too much different now I do not think. When I (inaudible) at the other end of things, Kihei or the Pacific Coast Highway in Southern California and places that have gone the full route, Kaua'i looks pretty good. Kaua'i is still a pretty quiet place. I brought my parents here. My mother just finished treatment and we got a nice place by the water on Spouting Horn Road. They were here for two (2) days and my mother said, "Bobby, your daddy wants to go back to Honolulu." I said, "Why?" They came from Virginia. She said, "He wants to go dancing. He wants music." She just finished her treatment and was feeling better, and that is what they did. I pouted around, then I figured that was her call, but it was too quiet for her. I was delivering the Advertiser, picking them up at 2:00 a.m. and getting back home at 8:00 a.m. I was the only guy awake on the island, except for the bread man; not even the police. I never saw any police, so it was pretty quiet there, but it is still pretty quiet. I think you have done really, really good to keep it that way. I guess we come back not because of Waimea Canyon and things that we have seen a bunch of times, but because of the local people here that we visit and they live in Po'ipū, so that is where we stay. Through the years of course, just like probably a lot of people, I have been alarmed at the development that I have seen in Po'ipū. But so far, it has sort of been kept down at the other end of town. I have been heartened by the Kaneioluma development there and the fact that maybe more people will be drawn here who care about things like that and take a little time to try and learn some words in Hawaiian and take some time to meet and be friends with local people because I get more out of standing in line at Longs or Big Save in terms of "flavor" of the place than anywhere else in terms of public spaces. Other places are starting to depress me a little bit like when I go to the Hyatt and get my paper or something is a little depressing to me.

Committee Chair Chock: Mr. Williams, I am sorry, but there is a three (3) minute limit to the testimony.

Mr. Williams: Okay. What I was going to say is that there are people here who seem to run things who have title to the land. There are other people here who own the land. They own the land; they do not have title to it, but they own it because their family is buried here, they have been here for generations, they worked here, and so on. You might think that those people do not own the land because they do not have title to it, but they can vote. When somebody says... I heard the Chairman say, "This is just the way things are and this is the way

things are going to be and we cannot do anything about it.” You can do something about it. That is my point.

Committee Chair Chock: I appreciate that. For those of you who have more testimony outside of three (3) minutes, you will have a second chance to come back after everyone has had a chance. Next speaker, please.

Ms. Yamauchi: The next speaker is Julie Souza, followed by Derek Johnson.

JULIE SOUZA: *Aloha* Councilmembers. Thank you for letting us sit here all day. A lot of the South Kauaʻi Community Plan did not pertain to most of us, I think, but I had a testimony to do today in defense of Hoʻona Road, but saw in this plan where our Hoʻona Road, our little neighborhood, has been kept out of this VDA. I want to thank the Planning Commission, Planning Director, Kimi, and Marie for listening to our concerns. This would be the fourth time that we have come before a body requesting that our little neighborhood stay put as it is. Sometimes we forget that “money is the root to all evil” and we should not always be taking money. With that, I thank you for having us here today and thanking them once again. *Mahalo*.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Next speaker, please.

Ms. Yamauchi: Derek Johnson, followed by Bridget Hammerquist.

Committee Chair Chock: Derek Johnson is not present. Next speaker.

BRIDGET HAMMERQUIST: Good afternoon. Thank you for having us. My name is Bridget Hammerquist and I was born in Hawaiʻi. My parents raised five (5) of us, almost all on sugar plantations. By the time I was in college, my dad was getting ready to end his career at Kaumakani and Olokele Sugar. My mother was a nurse at Kauaʻi Veterans Memorial Hospital (KVMH). I have long-time ties and deep affection for the island of Kauaʻi. As a community member, I just wanted to respond to the plan because good, bad, or indifferent—I know you said that the concerns today are going to be somewhat about the dairy and that is the reason I am here. The plan did not include the dairy or consider it at all. We actually attended Kōloa Neighborhood Center trying to get them to consider the impact of the dairy. It is sizable. It is in itself an investment, but it is going to have an impact on one of the stated goals of the plan, which is to keep Poʻipū a world class visitor destination area with clean beaches. I just wanted to bring to your attention today some things that are happening in other parts of the United States. In particular, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a study in 2012 and if you “google” three (3) words: “Yakima, EPA, and nitrate,” you will be greeted with a three hundred seven (307) page study that took years to complete, but it concluded that a herd of six hundred ninety-nine (699) or seven hundred (700) cows produces a waste load for the land, which is an equivalent of one hundred fifteen thousand (115,000) people. That dairy is planned for a site in Māhāʻulepū Valley and you have to picture the waste load of one hundred fifteen thousand (115,000) people’s untreated waste on the land. That is what six hundred ninety-nine (699) cows are going to do. The odor, the flies, and attendant nuisances that come with that operation will obviously have an impact on a world class visitor destination area and should have been considered. I strongly recommend and I am asking the Council to return the plan to the Planning Department and ask if nothing else, no

matter what their finding is, that they in fact consider that operation. The other real sizable impact it will have is to our freshwater. We have three (3) wells in Māhā‘ulepū— those three (3) County wells provide all the fresh drinking water for Po‘ipū and for much of Kōloa. Right now in the city of Des Moines, Iowa, a lawsuit was just filed seeking one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) in damages for nitrate pollution of well water. We have well water lawsuits going on in the United States in Kiwanis, Wisconsin and Yakima...

Committee Chair Chock: Your first three (3) minutes are up. You may come up later again after everyone has had a chance to testify.

Ms. Hammerquist: Okay. I will come back later if I may. I just had a few more comments. Thank you for your time.

Ms. Yamauchi: The next speaker is Eileen Kechloian, followed by Makoto Lane.

EILEEN KECHLOIAN: Hi, my name is Eileen Kechloian. I am a resident of Hawai‘i and I live on the island of Kaua‘i. I am asking that you all reconsider actual adoption of this plan until there is further study done on the impacts to tourism, quality of life, drinking water, clean beaches and healthy beaches, which are all visions that this plan has because of the impact of the dairy. Its compatibility, I believe, is incorrect just as far as the plan is concerned. There are obviously other things that I think are not so great about it, but as far as the plan is concerned, most counties have an interim zoning between an intensive farming and normal farming. This is intensive; it is a factory farm. It does not belong next to urban. There should be an intermediary zoning that should be in place for that. The other problem I have is that IAL designation. There was a bill in front of the House and a bill in front of the Senate that was to limit that to small farms, but it seemed to have died somewhere along the lines where it kept getting deferred and has not been brought back up. I, myself was raised part-time on a dairy, so I know what the impact is of being on a dairy is. I know about the flies and the smell; that is from my childhood. As an adult, I owned a home in the countryside that was two and a half (2.5) miles from a dairy. It was a fairly good sized dairy, but it had lots of acreage too. On my property itself, I could not smell the smells because there was thirty (30) acres of woods on my property and acreage from next door, so a lot of the smell was being absorbed. But the flies were not being absorbed. The flies were coming in and I would have to wear long-sleeved shirts, long pants, shoes, and socks during the summer. This is what will happen to your tourists. They will disappear because they do not want to wear long-sleeved shirts and long pants in Hawai‘i. Thank you for your time.

MAKOTO LANE: Makoto Lane. I live in Kōloa. As I testified earlier about the traffic, with the culmination of the South Kaua‘i Community Plan, Līhu‘e Community Plan, and the proposed developments on the east and north side, we are looking at doubling our standing population, which currently is approximately one hundred thousand (100,000) to one hundred twenty-five thousand (125,000) people. We are going to double that within the next ten (10) years to fifteen (15) years, possibly. The South Kaua‘i Community Plan promotes overdevelopment. I am not sure if this Council, the Mayor, or the Planning Department really understands what is lost when you overdevelop. I have seen a lot of changes here since ‘Iniki from what I have been familiar with. I grew up in Southern California in Orange County. There used to be orange groves, strawberry fields, and cattle, and I saw it completely developed from the beach to the foothills,

and a lot of natural resources lost. I am seeing the same things happening here. Do not approve the South Kaua'i Community Plan as it stands. Again, it promotes overdevelopment. There are no new roads incorporated with it, no sewage treatment plant, doubles the traffic, and doubles the people at Po'ipū Beach who already suffer and is inundated from overcrowding if you guys go down there. It also rezones large chunks of agricultural land to industrial and residential. Any of the locals that say, "You have to keep the agricultural land"—this does not do that. I want to talk about conflict of interest in this issue. I see that Arryl Kaneshiro has respectfully recused himself as he is financially attached to one of the companies that stand to benefit financially from this. I also want to add that any elected official that has taken campaign funds from any entity, such as Grove Farm, A&B, and Knudsen should also recused themselves from this issue as they are financially attached to these companies that stand a profit off of this general plan. I also want to reiterate what I have seen around on the internet and whatnot. It is false that transplants are the cause of overdevelopment here. Who is approving these projects? Who is sitting in the Mayor's Office that appoints pro-development Planning Commissioners? Who sits on the Council that approves them? It is not transplants? It is people who claim to be "local" and are funded by outside off-island corporate interests. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Next speaker, please.

Ms. Yamauchi: Allan Rachap, followed by Rupert Rowe.

ALLAN RACHAP: Good afternoon. Thank you for having me. I testified before. You are going to hear the same thing, basically. It is a good plan. A lot of hard work went into it by both government officials and volunteers, and I am in complete alignment with the vision for the plan. I think it is really, really something that you should be proud of, but I do not think you can adopt it when it ignores the "eight hundred (800) pound gorilla" in the room, which is the dairy farm. These guys have to take a look at the implications of the dairy farm. That gorilla has a big appetite. It is going to eat the visitor industry down in the south shore. It is going to take away—I am guessing—not guessing, but I have done some refine studies on it—about eight million dollars (\$8,000,000) worth of County of Kaua'i real estate tax revenue a year. That is the kind of hit that real estate is going to take if that dairy goes in. The plan, if you look at it in detail at the back, Section 6.5 has indicators; measures of success. "How are we doing?" There used to be a mayor in New York, Abe Beame, who used to go around when I was a kid and say, "How am I doing?" People would tell him. They have a, "What are we doing with this plan? How is it working?" If you look at it, Section 6.5.3, one of the measures of success is "improve water quality." As it has been pointed out, the wells in Māhā'ulepū generate all of the water for Po'ipū and much of Kōloa. What are you going to do when the Department of Water (DOW) comes to you and asks for a couple of million dollars to replace those things because they are nitrate contaminated? That has been the experience on the mainland. My background is economics. I was in the finance business and if you look at Section 6.5.5 in terms of indicators and measures of success, what they are trying to do is "increase the number of jobs and reduce unemployment." Well, you are talking ten (10) or fifteen (15) dairy farm jobs versus hundreds of visitor industry jobs that are at risk. They also want to increase the number of visitors and occupancy rates. Is that going to happen two (2) miles downwind from the dairy farm with the flies and smell? I do not think so. Finally, as I pointed out, increased property values and tax collections. We have studies that show that a minimum hit on property values would be about thirty percent (30%) and it is likely to be much larger in a visitor

destination area that is full of discretionary visits. People can say, "I do not want to go to Po'ipū." Just read Trip Advisor and Yelp. They say, "Do not go there. It smells like manure and you will get stung by flies." The economic hit is going to be all over the County. Thank you.

Ms. Yamauchi:

Rupert Rowe, followed by Terrie Hayes.

RUPERT ROWE: My name is Rupert Rowe. Good afternoon. I forgot to tell you good morning when I was here earlier. Anyway, I like to do my presentations very short and direct. We have a couple of things that is at stake down there. Do we have a drainage plan? That is number one. Po'ipū Beach Park parking lot is a temporary catchment right now for the drainage that is coming down. That is why the parking lot in a rainy season does not function the way it should function. Secondly, I believe the Planning Department— any growth, whether it is a subdivision, new hotel, or vacation rental— two (2) things should come out of that: how much cars we are putting on the road should be placed in the report that they present to you, so that we can have an understanding of the traffic flow on this whole island; not just a particular area because what is happening is that the whole island becomes locked down, as we noticed with an accident that took place. It was just a small section of that island that took a great hit. We do not have an answer from the Planning Department...this always go back to the Planning Department because they have been "kicking the bucket down the road." They have never come up with a true resource on how much cars are on the road. That is the most important thing. Hearing the Transportation presentation this morning, it tells us that we will not have what we believe we can do now in the future. It was a very honest and direct presentation from them, but the Planning Department did not present the questions on "how are we going to handle the traffic?" You cannot stop growth, but you can manage it. That is the first thing that you have to understand. When you live on an island, then you must have reasons how to manage this island. If we look at the people of Hawai'i, they had an output on how to manage this island. We only have a temporary solution, but not the answer to the problem. This problem is greater than anybody in this room right now, whether it is the Council, the citizens of this island, and the visitors of this island: we do not have an answer. We must have an answer so that we can focus our true energy, but not like the Hawaiians say "*wala'au*." You cannot be talking nonsense unless you have the answers. That is all I have to say. *Aloha*.

Committee Chair Chock: *Mahalo*. Next speaker.

Ms. Yamauchi: The next speaker is Terrie Hayes, followed by Joanne Broe Burkhardt.

TERRIE HAYES: *Aloha*. Terrie Hayes for the record. Thank you for allowing us all to speak. I also want to thank the Planning Commission and those that helped preserve Ho'ona Road as a residential area. I think it is really important that you heard the voice of the people, and that is who I come as; the voice of the people, the people of Po'ipū. There are a couple of things that I would like to say. One of them is please scale down the project. There is no reason to put one thousand one hundred (1,100) anything in Po'ipū, be it cows or more people. We cannot tolerate that kind of development where we sit or stand right now. I only heard one mention in the presentation about storm water runoff, which is what Rupert was just speaking of. I have a real difficult time believing that the trees they are going to put on Hoowili Road are going to absorb enough storm water. We are planting trees currently in Kaneioulouma. Every time it rains on our street, it



floods terribly. We had the opportunity to visit Māhā‘ulepū Valley recently on a site visit after a stormy day and it was totally inundated with water already. Again, for the proposed dairy or animal factory as it would be really has no proof that they are not going to contaminate our water. Instead of us trying to ask you to do it, they need to prove that it is not going to happen. Again, who would want to live— if you look at the map for the Gateway project, the corner of it actually abuts the lines they are showing and that is Māhā‘ulepū Valley. Who would want to live next to this dairy? This is one hundred eighty-six (186) acres next to a five hundred seventy-five (575) acre proposed dairy. It does not make any sense, especially with the storm water issue and that is what I would really like to appeal to the most. There has been a recent action presented on behalf of Friends of Māhā‘ulepū and it deals with a lack of a permit to actually prevent such storm water runoff, which encompasses many things, but when you start grading, which is already happening there. It is already happening near the crater, which I was pretty surprised to see. There is a whole area that that has been grubbed and graded and that causes storm water runoff. The next rain we have will add to it. It is maybe individually these little areas, you think “it is not so much,” but if you come down to Po‘ipū where we live and you look at the parking lot, that is actually an estuary when it rains, which is what it is supposed to be actually and probably should be at some point. It was fishponds.

Committee Chair Chock:           *Mahalo*, Ms. Hayes.

Ms. Hayes:                           I will be back. Thank you.

Ms. Yamauchi:                   Joanne Broe Burkhardt, followed by  
Kalanikumai ‘O Nā Ali‘i Hanohano.

JOANNE BROE BURKHARDT:       *Aloha*. Thank you for having me. I am Joanne Burkhardt. I just want to say that I grew up in Southern California. It was a rural area. I lived in Laguna Beach. Through all the buildup behind us, we became the dirtiest beach in California with all the nitrates. We had a water reclamation right behind us. It did not make any difference. It taxed our whole sewer systems. Everything went to the beach. These kinds of things are not really set up and I think that you need to have that foresight to be able to plan these future communities, which will make a big impact on what is going on right now by having such high density in such a small acreage besides the dairy. Those are my biggest concerns. Water and our natural resources are becoming rarer. We do not know what is going to be happening in our future. We know that is not getting as much rain as we had before. I am urging you to please take a look at what goes on. We need reclamation centers for water, sewage, and all those things, but we do not have them in place. It will make a huge difference. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock:           Next speaker.

Ms. Yamauchi:                   Kalanikumai ‘O Nā Ali‘i Hanohano, followed  
by Greg Peters.

KALANIKUMAI ‘O NĀ ALI‘I HANOHANO: *Aloha*. I hope you folks bear with me for a minute and as you provided so much extra time for the first group, maybe you will have a little leeway for us who have been waiting since 11:00 a.m. I have copies of my draft to pass out. My name is Kalanikumaikamaka ‘O Nā Ali‘i Hanohano. Most people know me by my *nome de gare*, Branch Harmony. I am a *kama‘āina* of Kōloa, seventh generation. My families include Schimmelfenning’s,

Brandt's, (inaudible), Neil's, (inaudible), Cockett's, and most importantly Nakapa'ahu's. I am a *mamo* Hawai'i and I also represent Hui Hānai I Kā Honua La'a, "Nurturers of Sacred Earth." I am a farmer, *mahi'ai* and I am a cultural practitioner. A little history lesson to begin with— in 2002, this Council passed a resolution introduced by Ron Kouchi, backed by Councilwoman Yukimura, supporting the preservation of Māhā'ulepū. Representative Mina Morita introduced a similar resolution at the State Legislature, which also was adopted. Please honor and respect the previous work of this Council. Kōloa is one of three (3) *moku* of the Kona District of Kaua'i: Kōloa, Makaweli, Waimea, and Ni'ihau. The boundaries run from the Hā'upu range from the eastern side of the Wahiawa Gulch. Kōloa is not and has never been an *ahupua'a*. It is the name of the modern town. Prior to western contact, the area now comprising Kōloa Town was part of a large wetland swamp; the stream, Wailana, crossing Maluhia Road means "floating water." It was home to millions of Kōloa duck. Human occupation was mostly centered around the Waihohonu water-filled crater, now Waitā, and from Mauhili, an *'ili*, southward along the coast through Weliweli to Māhā'ulepū. Most of modern day Kōloa is (inaudible) or Mauhili. The name "Kōloa" is attributable not only to the tall cane that grew there, but to the Kōloa duck indigenous to the area of Kōloa, "the long, drawn-out wail" of the *mo'o* living in the lava tube in Mauhili and to Koloaikapohu, "the creeking of the calm," a predominate meteorological feature, as well as the nearby peak of the Hā'upu range. Māhā'ulepū— your plans Section 3.1.57... deficiencies in this plan exist in predominate cultural features in this area ignored by this plan include four (4) major *heiau* locations: one, the petroglyph rock in the rear of the valley now known to be connected to the adjacent grouped inscribed boulders moved some forty (40) yards further east into the tree line, Unuunu, temple, an equivalent distance to the south; two, the plateau site at about four hundred (400) feet above the petroglyph site, about sixty (60) feet deep and two hundred (200) feet in length displaying signs of human occupation, delineated areas, and stories of looted funerary objects.

Committee Chair Chock: *E kala mai e kupuna*, I know you have more to share and we want to hear it...

Mr. 'O Nā Ali'i Hanohano: I cannot come back. I have to go back to my farm and do my chores. If you could grant me another minute, as you have granted so much to the previous presenters. I am sure this information is pertinent.

Committee Chair Chock: Hold on. We honor that you have a lot to say and we want to hear everything that you have to say, but in fairness to everyone that is here, I want to be sure that we can have everyone participate and give public testimony. If you can stay, that would be my preference.

Mr. 'O Nā Ali'i Hanohano: I cannot, but I could have finished in the time that you had taken right there. May you allow me twenty (20) seconds more?

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. I will give you twenty (20) seconds then.

Mr. 'O Nā Ali'i Hanohano: Okay. Mauhili— Green Pond, recent clearing of the lot providing access to Mauhili on Waikomo Stream by the owner, Knudsen Trust, raises questions concerning protection of this legendary site, a *wahi pana*, and the location of the first *heiau* on Kaua'i's south shore. This plan does not consider the impending issue of public access from Weliweli Road going past the old

mill to Māhā'ulepū. Please send this plan back for revision regarding cultural impacts. *Mahalo iā'oe* and thank you.

Ms. Yamauchi:  
Suzanne Kashiwaeda.

The next speaker is Greg Peters, followed by

GREG PETERS: Good afternoon. Thank you to the Councilmembers for the opportunity to provide comment here today. For the record, my name is Greg Peters. I am the Executive Director for Mālama Māhā'ulepū, a nonprofit, that has been spending the past four (4) years advocating for the wise land use of the Māhā'ulepū Valley in the *ahupua'a* in general. We had seven (7) members here today, including much of our Board of Directors, but we felt that in the interest of time and respect for the Council, we would consolidate that and I could provide the official comment for the organization. Our organization has always believed that conservation initiatives for Māhā'ulepū must attain multiple goals, and that includes fair compensation for any lands, which uses for with landowner give up public purposes while satisfying the landowner's desire to maintain management control; permanent protection of special and vulnerable landforms, water resources, plants, and animals; and the establishment of permanent and managed public access. The desire to permanently set aside Māhā'ulepū from development has been articulated for forty (40) years including in the 2000 General Plan. It is for this reason that we have continued to advocate to the County to continue its focus on securing appropriate access and protection mechanisms, while limiting intensive uses of the area. For that reason, we believe that the current South Kaua'i Community Plan Draft lays the appropriate foundation for reaching our goals. We have followed the plan process and the plan's content regarding preservation of the natural and cultural resources and history of Māhā'ulepū's *ahuapua'a*. We have provided comment and scrutiny to ensure the legitimate long-range policy document that looks at the future of the community and fairly assesses its needs. We have seen a number of improvements over the previous development plan in the earlier drafts of this document since we have been involved about one year and a half (1.5) ago. We appreciate the attention to detail and the recommendations which build upon the Kōloa community and the County's past efforts to recognize this area as a need of protection and careful management. We appreciate the efforts made for public involvement, including our opportunity as an organization and as individual members to provide meaningful input at community meetings, local events, online, in person with the planners, and by attending and providing oral and written testimony at Planning Commission meetings last fall. We look forward to continue providing input to the County, driving future management decisions of the Māhā'ulepū area and we look forward to our involvement in the integration of the General Plan update. Thank you.

Councilmember Hooser: Thank you for your testimony. I take it that the organization met with and worked in the process and you are pleased with the outcome. Is that what you are saying at the end of the day?

Mr. Peters: That is correct. We have been involved in the process from the early beginnings in 2013. Our group and as individual members, we have provided input. Our Board Treasurer Marty Kuala has done a fantastic job representing our organization on the CAC.

Councilmember Hooser: Okay, so were the protections to that area sufficient? Did you see greater protections that you did not achieve? Earlier, the Council talked about reviewing and approving the plan, but what is not talked

about that much is our ability to amend the plan and to make changes to the plan. I want to be clear that this particular area, which is particularly sensitive to many of us— do you think there is sufficient protection?

Mr. Peters: Yes, that is correct. We feel that the document satisfies its mission of a long-range thirty thousand (30,000) feet view policy approach to the south shore; visioning goals and policies, and we believe that the document excels in that. We have significant concerns about individual land uses that we feel are tremendously incompatible with Māhā‘ulepū’s ecosystems, but we feel that that would be best approached later through the zoning process.

Councilmember Hooser: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Peters: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: You have another question.

Council Chair Rapozo: Thank you because I think a lot of people interpret this process as being a zoning hearing or this is the big thirty thousand (30,000), so I appreciate you clarifying that. My question is as far as the process was concerned because we received numerous testimonies via E-mail, which some were complaining that they were not informed. Do you believe that the process was fair? We have received testimonies from people who said it was and that it was well-done and done appropriately. I guess I am hearing that you are saying that the process in your opinion was done in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. Peters: For my opinion, and at this point I am speaking as an individual resident of Kōloa— we went and sought out involvement from the very beginning, so we wanted to make sure that community’s needs for conservation approaches to the area were clearly recognized. I sent in my wish card, too. I think that is part of the stack there. Part of Māhā‘ulepū— that is as big as it is because of our members providing those inputs. We were at the County Fair filling out those surveys. Mālama Māhā‘ulepū actually had its own community survey at the County Fair that we used to provide to the Planning Department. We have been engaged from the beginning and we felt like the County did a suitable job. I also want to make the point of recognizing that all of our involvement has been strictly within the parameters of Māhā‘ulepū preservation, so we feel like within that context, the County did a great job, yes.

Council Chair Rapozo: Thank you.

Mr. Peters: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Next speaker.

SCOTT K. SATO, Council Services Review Officer: The next speaker is Suzanne Kashiwaeda, followed by Jim Cherry.

SUZANNE KASHIWAEDA: I am Suzanne Kashiwaeda and I am the President of the Board for Mālama Māhā‘ulepū. Greg presented the official position, but I had to come and say my piece, not so much as a board member, but as a social worker and also as somebody who has been a homeowner in Kalāheo for forty (40) years and Māhā‘ulepū has been in my heart for even longer than that. I just wanted to say that I was glad that in the plan, that area was specifically designated

as a natural and cultural resource and recognized as such. As Greg said, we hope that we can continue that conversation on how we can preserve it forever. I was really glad of the wording in the plan and references to our children and our grandchildren because that is who we all live for. As a social worker, I just really wanted to push the point of how we need these areas of open space in our community that is so dense. I have worked in the disability field for many, many years. I have worked in the schools and have worked with those kids that live in Pa'anau and all the housing projects there, and those families and kids need places like Māhā'ulepū. Mālama Māhā'ulepū used to do excursions and it just opens up those kids eyes and connects the learning in the classroom with that outdoor education. It is such a great resource and I just would not want to see it spoiled. Anyway, that is my piece. Thank you very much. I also did want to say that I did participate in the 1978 General Plan and this process is totally more open than it was back in 1978, for the record.

Committee Chair Chock:

Next speaker.

Mr. Sato:  
Juliana Cherry.

The next speaker is Jim Cherry, followed by

JIM CHERRY: Hi, I am Jim Cherry. First, I want to say that I am really grateful for that presentation this morning. Your interpretation of the speakers this morning was very good. I was impressed. I was not too surprised, but I was impressed with your interpretation and your work. Most of my comments have to do with the highway infrastructure. I cut it down a lot because of what you said this morning. I wanted to point out a few things. Currently in Po'ipū, there are nine (9) developments in the VDA that had been approved and are currently in various stages of progress, including Po'ipū Beach Estates, Kōloa Landing, Pili Mai, Kukui'ula, Royal Palms at Po'ipū Beach, Kiahuna Golf Resort, Wainani, Po'ipū Sheraton Kaua'i expansion, and Land Court. Upon completion of the permitted number of units will be an excessive one thousand nine hundred (1,900) or conservatively, let us say five thousand seven hundred (5,700) people. Let us say maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of three thousand (3,000) automobiles added to the population. As stated in the SKCP, the proposed Gateway Mixed-Use Village will add another one thousand one hundred (1,100) new residential units at minimum. This will increase those figures to a total of approximately nine thousand (9,000) new residents and approximately four thousand five hundred (4,500) automobiles. So far, all we have seen in road improvements have been the roundabout and the new access road from Kukui'ula to Kōloa Road. My conclusion basically is that the infrastructure is not in place in the roads to take care of that many cars and that many people and I think we need to do something. I know we are talking about growth here and I am in favor of growth, but I am also in favor of stopping the issue of permits until the roadway is underway. If you are not able to do the roadwork, then you are not able to do the developments. That is all I have to say. Thank you very much.

Mr. Sato:  
by David Gregorius.

The next speaker is Juliana Cherry, followed

JULIANA CHERRY: Hi, I am Juliana Cherry and I am also a resident of Weliweli Tract. I hope that you will read my whole thing, which I sent you very early this morning. It is very long. I am going to try to just take some main parts out of it because I have been studying the plan for the last couple of weeks when I just found out about it, like the end of February. I know that there

was a lot of outreach, but there are many of us who did not know about it. I went around door to door in Weliweli Tract and talked to forty (40) to fifty (50) people and very few have heard of it. They are concerned about development. From the vision, taking the second part of South Kaua'i, "balanced, responsible development enhances existing communities preserving the local, rural lifestyle that embodies South Kaua'i and is cherished by residents and visitors alike." That does not need to be improved on. Let us see how we can make this happen. One of the things that rubs me the wrong way after reading through that Appendix C and understanding that form-based code is the "regulatory framework that preserves, enhances, and creates walkable urbanism. Urbanism is defined as the lifestyle of city dwellers. "Urbanism" is the opposite of "rural." What happened to our rural lifestyle? We are trying to create the city in the rural area. We do not need more commercial land use. We have Kukui'ula, which is blossoming and huge. They are putting in a Longs Drugs and ABC Store. What about our small business owners? My heart went out to the little pharmacy up in Kōloa. What happens to Sueoka Store, Big Save, and Kukui'ula Market when Costco comes in? It is nice to walk through the store maybe for some folks and get a quart of milk, but if we have to drive, hop on the bus, or take a bike, let us let a little travel happen there. It sounds so great with the sidewalk improvements, transit, etcetera. The housing— it feels to me like the one thousand one hundred (1,100) units are being sold as affordable and medium income housing because there are no vacation destination units there, but we know that landowners and developers want to make money off of their asset. That is a given. There is nothing to say that is bad, but we do have that to deal with. A developer in my understanding from when I talked to the Planning Department and a little bit of reading is that thirty percent (30%) of all units have to go towards low income housing— I do not know if that is federal, state, or county— and that the developer has the option of buying out of that.

Committee Chair Chock: Ms. Cherry, that was your time. Can you come back to finish?

Ms. Cherry: I will.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you.

Mr. Sato: Our last registered speaker is David Gregorius.

DAVID GREGORIUS: David Gregorius. I live in Weliweli Tract. Hopefully I can do this in one portion because I have to go. I am here to encourage you to edit and amend the South Community Kaua'i Plan, at least the portion pertaining to the Po'ipū Gateway Mixed-Use Village, which is Section 4.1.1.5. I realize that Ms. Williams just said that there are many more hoops to go through and more chances for input, so I changed what I was going to say. I have been here since 9:00 a.m. and it is my wife's birthday and I am already in the dog house, so I am going to change my focus of what I am going to say here. I am going to challenge the amount of input that the community actually had. They described that they were very ambitious and well-intended with sending out six thousand three hundred (6,300) flyers; however one hundred (100) people showed up at the first kick-off. I was actually there. My suggestion card is actually in the plan on the website, so I have proof that I was there, but there was no mention of the Po'ipū Gateway Mixed-Use Village because I would have kind of thrown up a red flag if I had seen that. Yes, there was opportunity for community input. I acknowledge that, but I think most people did not know, as Juliana just mentioned, or else they

missed it, and we definitely did not know about this one thousand one hundred (1,100) unit village going in Po'ipū. I thought that would be about three thousand (3,000) people or two thousand (2,000) more cars. He said nine thousand (9,000) and four thousand five hundred (4,500). Anyway, once I got word of this, specifically this village, I asked all of my neighbors that I know and not one of them was aware of it. For the record, nobody thought it was a very good idea. Everybody was like, "Whoa," just like me. Saying that the plan has the input and the backing of the community is a real stretch if you ask me; if not, completely false. Just a couple of last thoughts, Councilmember Kagawa just gave his own personal story several hours ago about how he had to move from Waimea Valley because of the traffic coming out of the tree tunnel, and I just imagine one thousand one hundred (1,100) more houses down there and whatever two thousand (2,000) or four thousand (4,000) cars or whatever it is. I know you mentioned that this is intended as affordable housing or affordable living for the resort workers, which I do think is a very good idea. I think that is important, but I do not know if that is the spot for it. I think that is probably an expensive place to put a bunch of houses. I do not know if the resort worker is going to be able to afford that, so people that end up buying homes there are going to end up commuting to Līhu'e like the rest of us or go all the way to Kapa'a. I think the whole plan, or at least the Po'ipū Gateway thing creates more traffic on the road, a lot of that commuting to Līhu'e, pollution to the ocean, and just overall crowding on the south side of Kaua'i. I am opposed to it. I am sorry. Most of the people that I met going door to door do, too. I am sorry. I have to take off.

Committee Chair Chock: Hold on. I know you have to go because you are in trouble, but you have a question here from Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you for raising the questions that you have. In terms of that development, the thought is that people will not have to get in their cars to go to work, that they can walk, bike, or take the Po'ipū Shuttle, which we hope to see come every ten (10) minutes to get to work, and therefore not cause any car traffic even within the Po'ipū area or on the main highways. Your question about whether it is going to be affordable is a key question that I will be asking the Planners, otherwise we will not achieve our purpose. If we can find a way to keep it affordable, my question is if it is not there, then where?

Mr. Gregorius: That is a good question. I do not know if like more *mauka* by Kōloa Road or above Kukui'ula and just moving it further—I do not know. I do not have the answer to that. I am not a civil engineer or planner. It just seems crowded down there already—not crowded...it is not crowded, you are right. It is "potentially" crowded and putting that many more people in that area is not going to be good.

Councilmember Yukimura: Well, would you like the existing R-6 that continues Weliweli Tract where it would probably come out of your entrance?

Mr. Gregorius: That could be worse I guess.

Councilmember Yukimura: Anyway, I just asked the question because we are all trying to find solutions to this, so if you have any ideas, I wanted to know it.

Mr. Gregorius: I wish I did.



Councilmember Yukimura: But I do not want to keep you from your wife.

Mr. Gregorius: It is tough on either side, so I appreciate the work that you do. I do not know how you guys can sit here and listen to people talk. It is like going to school again. That is a difficult job that you have.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you for your participation because it is part of the process. I am sorry that we did not get you at the earlier part of the process, but we do appreciate that you are here today, and now you better go.

Mr. Gregorius: Okay. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Would anyone who has not testified testify at this time? If there are more, it would be important for us to know ahead of time if you want to testify. Come on up. I know you have not had a chance yet. Chris, can you sign up if you would like to speak on this item?

TESSIE KINNEMAN: Aloha Committee Chair Chock and Councilmembers. My name is Tessie Kinneman. I only wanted to say a couple of things regarding this plan. First, I appreciate that the VDA designation for the Ho'ona neighborhood, but I would like to go one step further. I hope it is the proper word, but through "attrition" these nonconforming use permits that are already there with the homes and my thought is that if the homes are sold that those nonconforming use permits are forfeited, and then they would have to come back in and reapply for a nonconforming use permit. That way, they can get back to the real old neighborhood and hopefully they will just be an old neighborhood. That is another thing that I think the use permits for at least the whole island be reviewed as a ways to raise funds besides raising our vehicle tax. There are a lot of uses where it is not nonconforming, so we could make some funds out of that, reviewing the use permits and maybe the fees be renewed every year or every two (2) years. Another thing, which everybody spoke about it, is the traffic concerns. The carrying capacity for this island is...I think we are overloaded on the same roads that we have to drive on every day. We all would like some new bypass roads, but it is going to be difficult, especially with the DOT saying that they cannot, especially one of the main roads to get around the island. There is no way to solve it. Fortunately in Kōloa-Po'ipū, we have a pretty nice circulation plan there, besides the roundabout, which is my favorite thing in Po'ipū. We need two (2) or three (3) more in the Kōloa-Po'ipū area. The last thing that I would like to talk about is the environment of our south shore. I think the land uses that go on in the south shore really need to take into account the effect on the water flow towards the ocean because when I was little, we used to go to Māhā'ulepū almost every weekend. You could just go into the water right there on the reef, pick up your *limu*, do you thing, and eat it. Even with fishing, you could just catch the fish. Now, there is no *limu*. You have to almost dive underwater to get *limu*. As you age, you cannot dive so deep. That is pretty much what I had to say. I think we need to really take care of our environment and the runoff from our land. It is just sad where we are going. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. You have a question from Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: Actually, Tessie, I just want to thank you and all the citizens of Kōloa who actually are responsible for the Charlier traffic circulation plan for Kōloa-Po'ipū because it was not government who initiated it or

did it, it was you citizens who asked for a moratorium and that brought the landowners and developers to the table, and they funded the plan, which is why we have it today. Thank you and thank you to the landowner and developers who responded in a very constructive way as well.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Kinneman: May I add to that comment?

Committee Chair Chock: That question?

Ms. Kinneman: Yes, please. Thank you. The one other traffic solution I am looking forward to before the rest of the multi-family units come up around there in Kiahuna, would be the roundabout there at the Kiahuna and Po'ipū intersection where Keoki's is. That is slated for a roundabout also, but not as huge as the one there by Kukui'ula. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Mr. Gampon.

CHRIS GAMPON: For the record, my name is Chris Gampon. I am the General Manager for Outrigger Kiahuna Vacation Rental Program and also the Association of Beachhouse Owners of Kiahuna Plantation. I came to a previous hearing and testified regarding Bills Nos. 2577 and 2578, and I come with the same comments regarding Bill No. 2576. As a property that has been in place at Po'ipū for a long time, we feel responsible to represent the customers and the people who are already there. As I have previously testified, the traffic in the area is terrible and this plan, which I had looked at previously online and downloaded it and looked through it, is interesting in the fact that it supports the same idea where the top comments that were left were to improve pedestrian and bike access to the roads, parks and public areas, and parking; so every single thing that we have been trying to get attention for in that Po'ipū area, especially in the corridor that specifically affects Kiahuna Plantation, but is part of that Po'ipū Road and the roundabouts that have been planned, the complete streets, and the concepts that have been pushed forward is part of the plan. I think it is important to reiterate that and ask that when the Council looks at the budgeting and there is opportunity to invest in the improvement of the roadways and finding some parking along Po'ipū Road that we do not take that as a first choice to save on the cost of operating the County because I know that there is an opportunity and we are short thirty million dollars (\$30,000,000). To some extent, I just want to campaign for the idea that it is important and the money is worth it. One more thing— there was somebody who testified and said that they want to “keep agricultural land, agricultural land” and so forth. There is the Kilauea Agricultural Center on the agenda, but I think it is important to remember that you have to support your local farmers because my understanding is that there are not enough farmers for the agricultural land that we have now. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Those who would like to testify a second time, would you come up at this time? Hold on, we have a first time speaker. Welcome back.

MARY MILLS: Aloha. Mary Mills for the record. I pretty much would like to just see a moratorium on everything. I just feel that if everything that has already been planned is grown and the development— we are going to be overloaded. I am also concerned about the traffic and evacuation in case

of a tsunami or something. In November when the marathon was happening— I live in Kalāheo and I was on my way to work to go to Po'ipū and I knew that the Lāwa'i Road was going to be closed, so I would probably more than likely have to go through the tree tunnel road, so I left a little bit early and I was in bumper to bumper traffic from Kalāheo. Lāwa'i Road and 'Ōma'o Road was closed, so I tried to ask a policeman and told him that I needed to go to Po'ipū, so he routed me to go through Maluhia Road, the "tree tunnel road." I turned. I had to wait a little bit to go into traffic. By that time, they opened the road to the public. By this time, it was almost nine o'clock. The road had been opened up and I could go to Po'ipū with no problem whatsoever. My mind was totally blown from the top of the tree tunnel all the way, bumper to bumper to pass the bridge. There were probably fifteen (15) more cars passed the bridge, bumper to bumper, trying to get out of Kōloa to go to Līhu'e or whichever way that they wanted to go. I do not know in this new plan if they can open up the old bypass road that you can go through the road to the hole in the mountain to get through, but there has to be some way to do some kind of evacuation for somebody to get out of there. Just last Friday night, I stayed home all day on and I finally decided at ten to six that it was time to go out of my house and I was going to go down to the Lāwa'i General Store. I was shocked because I could hardly...where the old Red Dirt Store comes down, it took me forever to get out there to get onto the main road and I could not believe that the traffic coming from Līhu'e was probably all the way up from...well, I could see it past...as far as I could see. Coming from Līhu'e, it was bumper to bumper, all the way through Kalāheo, all the way to the west side. I returned thinking, "Well, I will wait until the traffic dies down a little bit," so probably an hour later, I came back and that same traffic coming from Līhu'e going to the west side was still bumper to bumper. I say either a moratorium or at least amend that part about having one thousand one hundred (1,100) more houses in Po'ipū. Having that would be just absolutely devastating. *Mahalo.*

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Next speaker.

CATHERINE LO: *Aloha.* I was not going to testify today, but thank you for listening. I just want to take the opportunity to thank...

Committee Chair Chock: Before you being, can you just state your name for the record?

Ms. Lo: I am sorry. This is my second time that I forgot my name. My name is Catherine Lo, as in "lo and behold" I always say, not "high and low." I just want to take this opportunity to thank Kimi Yuen, the Planning Department, and the Planning Commission for listening to us about our little neighborhood, the Ho'ona Road neighborhood, and keeping it residential as the plan states with no VDA expansion. We hope that you approve that plan and we thank you very much. Have a nice afternoon.

Committee Chair Chock: Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: I just wanted to let you know that I do not think you really need to thank them. I think it is thanks to you guys for bringing it up because I do not think it is an unreasonable request to ask that a residential neighborhood stay residential. I think it is unreasonable if you are asking your residential neighborhood to become a VDA. That is unreasonable.

Ms. Lo: We thank them for listening to what we want.

Councilmember Kagawa: Exactly. I thank you guys for bringing it up.

Ms. Lo: The first draft did not have that and that is why we came together and presented our desires, especially to Marie Williams and Ian Jung. They listened, communicated with Kimi, and it became part of the draft. That is why we need to thank them. I hope you understand that.

Councilmember Kagawa: I understand. Thanks.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak for the first time? If not, I would like to go to our second round of anyone else who would like to testify for a second time. Ms. Hammerquist, I think you were one of those people. Would you like to come up first?

Ms. Hammerquist: Thank you for having me back. In addition to living in Kōloa, I have served now for almost one (1) year as president of Friends of Māhā'ulepū. We took on the task of forming because we were very concerned about the proposed dairy, which is not included in the plan or evaluated by the plan. I will reiterate that we ask specifically that the Planning Department at least consider the dairy and its impact. I thank the Council for having us. I think a distinction should be made. Mālama Māhā'ulepū's Executive Director has put before you that he is happy with the language that promises to preserve the ecosystem and the environment of Māhā'ulepū, but I would also say that it is not really consistent to say that you are preserving the ecosystem and the cultural sites, historic sites, and cultural practices of Māhā'ulepū if you do not consider a six hundred ninety-nine (699) startup in a two thousand (2,000) cow dairy that is going to go in that same valley. I know that Mr. Peters and Mālama Māhā'ulepū have been trying very diligently to get the coastal area of that valley designated as a national park. They have been very reluctant to say anything publically that would inflame Grove Farm or their opportunity to get that transfer of land to go into a national park. There is no question, no matter what rhetoric is used, that the dairy needs to be considered for safety reasons, preservation of water quality, and preservation of the historic sites, cultural practices, and the *limu*, as that one woman said and the fish that are in the bay. The water is already polluted in Waiopili. That has been documented now for over one (1) year. The Department of Health has confirmed it. It is not yet posted. It may not be a pleasant topic, but I really think that this Council needs to help. The State is looking to hear from the Council. The Director of Wastewater has told us that she has not approved the animal feed operation for a dairy. There is no waste management approval that has happened for that operation, so I think she is looking to the County and the Planning Department to review and consider that operation in that valley and what it will do to the water. Like I said, if you "google" the words "EPA, nitrate, and Yakima," you will read about many communities that are having problems. I also think that it is important to consider the impact and envision putting one hundred fifteen thousand (115,000) people dropping their waste in that valley every day. I think it is totally inconsistent with making it a world class visitor destination. I ask you to consider that strongly. Thank you very much.

Committee Chair Chock: You have some questions here from Councilmember Yukimura and Councilmember Hooser.

Councilmember Yukimura: I just wanted to get what you said clear that no wastewater plan has been approved by the Department of Health.

Ms. Hammerquist: That is correct.

Councilmember Yukimura: But it is necessary in order for the dairy to operate.

Ms. Hammerquist: It is called a "Waste Management Plan approval" and it is necessary for the dairy operate as a dairy, yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: What is the timetable for that?

Ms. Hammerquist: I do not know what the Waste Branch Chief is waiting for. I know that she sent us a letter dated September 15th advising us formally that she had completed her review of the Waste Management Plan and they submit it, and she did not approve it. Whether she is waiting for them to come back with another form of a Waste Management Plan, I do not know. I do know that she said that she did not approve it and she did not intend to act on that one further. I can make a copy of that letter available to any of you if you want it. I also got a copy of a letter that went from the Clean Water Branch Chief, Alec Wong, directly to Kyle Datta dated January 16th of this year, in which he told Mr. Datta that they needed to have a National Pollution Elimination Discharge System (NPEDS) general construction permit, and that to operate without one was to put them at risk for a fine of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) a day. The State's fine structure was sent out. The State has taken and advised the dairy, but our point here today is just that before you forward with the plan that it needs to be a consideration of the plan. It is just too big an operation and too big an impact to the south shore.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Councilmember Hooser. Are you done, Councilmember Yukimura?

Councilmember Yukimura: I am done. Thank you.

Ms. Hammerquist: You are welcome. I hope I answered that okay.

Councilmember Yukimura: You did.

Ms. Hammerquist: If you need copies of anything, I am happy to forward them.

Councilmember Yukimura: I would like a copy of the letter to Kyle Datta.

Ms. Hammerquist: Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you.

Ms. Hammerquist: You are welcome.

Councilmember Hooser: I have a question. Relating to the plan, are you familiar with other communities that have in the planning process— it seems

clear that there are different kinds of agriculture, so there is intensive agriculture such as the dairy, huge factory poultry farms, or large cattle feed lot operations. I will ask the Director and the consultants this question also. Are you aware of in a planning perspective where you have commercial, residential, and then you have agricultural land, but whether designations for different types of agriculture as we move away from the population centers, are you aware of plans that have that?

Ms. Hammerquist: Yes.

Councilmember Hooser: So other plans would actually differentiate between different kinds of agriculture?

Ms. Hammerquist: Yes and we can make that available. We have secured copies from counties in the mainland that have been injured, so they have adopted planning zoning ordinance changes where they zone for industrial agriculture versus sustainable small farm agriculture, and there is a distinction in what it does to the environment. It is just a reality.

Councilmember Hooser: I would love to have those examples if you could because I think it relates directly to—I am sorry?

Committee Chair Chock: No, please continue.

Councilmember Hooser: I think the question of how other communities plan the land use around their towns and villages with regards to agriculture is relevant to this conversation.

Ms. Hammerquist: I agree.

Councilmember Hooser: Thank you very much.

Ms. Hammerquist: Thank you for having us and letting us voice our concern.

Councilmember Yukimura: Just one more question. It will be interesting to see the information you have, but would it not be possible that this issue needs to be addressed at a zoning level rather than a general plan level?

Ms. Hammerquist: Well, it depends on the characterization of the operation as it is now. Their application has been submitted. I am not sure that a zoning revision or amendment at this juncture would be deemed to apply since their application was already submitted to the County.

Councilmember Yukimura: I just meant in terms of the community plan process and the zoning process.

Ms. Hammerquist: No, I think it is absolutely a community plan issue because if you say on the one hand that we want a world class visitor destination center and clean beaches, and then you say on the other hand that we are going to put in an operation that is the equivalent of one hundred fifteen thousand (115,000) people at the start, leaving their waste in this valley every day untreated, and the two thousand (2,000) cows, it is three hundred twenty-eight thousand (328,000) people and that is a determination made by the EPA, so it is like you cannot have a plan that envisions this and ignores this. That is all we are

saying. The Planning Department needs to consider— they have considered the hotel industry and visitor destination industry...

Councilmember Yukimura: No, I think we all agree with the idea of protecting our resort property. I think we are getting too much into the detail. Thank you.

Ms. Hammerquist: Thank you.

Councilmember Kagawa: Chair, if I may, can we focus our Councilmember questions on other than the dairy because I certainly do not think that questions about the dairy are relevant to this plan. If I am not here, you do not have a quorum. Like I said, I said it before and I think Councilmember Rapozo mentioned it as well that this is not the forum to decide on whether the dairy is good or not. No decision on this plan is going to affect the dairy. Can we just keep our focus on the plan itself? If the public wants to testify about the dairy, they can, but I am asking members if we can avoid the dairy subject until perhaps the next meeting when we have four (4) or five (5) committee members. I certainly do not feel like the dairy is part of our decision in this South Kaua'i Community Plan. It is like going through Bill No. 2491 on the dairy when we have no power to do anything.

Committee Chair Chock: I understand both sides of the questions here that are being posed because I think that what we want to do is make sure we see where they are connected and where they are certainly not, so can we make sure that we limit that and understand where those boundaries are more as we move forward. I would appreciate that. Would you like to respond as well? We have a few more people that would like to testify.

Councilmember Hooser: I agree that perhaps a specific project may or may not be something that we want to talk about, but I think it is very relevant to talk about the impact of agricultural operations adjacent to residential, as well as resort lands. This is an appropriate topic for planning. This is about planning for the future and there are different kinds of agriculture and different kinds of impacts. I think it is about much more than the dairy. It is about planning in general and I think we need to have this discussion.

Committee Chair Chock: I think if we can limit it to that, then I think that will satisfy the members. With that, can we continue?

Mr. Rachap: I will be real quick. I just wanted to wind up because I did not get to finish of what you should do.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Please state your name once again.

Mr. Rachap: Allan Rachap. What I would do if I was sitting back there— as significant as this dairy thing is to the plan, I understand that you are talking about the plan. I am not asking you to vote up or down on whether there should be a dairy there, but what I think you should do is require that the Planning Department take a look at it. They ignored it. They did not really look at it and it is huge in terms of its potential implications. I understand Councilmember Yukimura's concern about providing housing. I can go along with the need. It is there, it is pressing, and it is prominent. Finding a place like Po'ipū

Gateway Village is fine. Workforce housing is one thing, but you cannot try to put in workforce housing when you are destroying the workforce by ruining the visitor industry if the critics of the dairy are right. Do I know that they are right? I think so. Do you know? You do not because nobody studied it. I think you should require that the Planning Department take a look at the economic impacts. What would real estate values do? What would County tax revenues do? What are all aspects of the economic implications of the dairy as far as the entire south shore and the entire island? To not look at something as huge as this takes a plan, which has a wonderful vision and says, "I see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil. Do not bother me." When I discussed this thing originally, it was barely a blimp on the radar and now it is a big deal because more and more people have looked at it. It is something that I think should be evaluated. I will end on a positive note that it will reduce traffic in the south shore area.

Committee Chair Chock:

Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Cherry: Juliana Cherry. Thank you for inviting me back. I was talking about the affordable housing and if it really will furnish that. There are some wonderful ocean views when you get up near the crater. What is the landowner proposing? What is he going to be obligated to? I feel that the density and the compactness of this more city-like suggested...they are going T-3 Village Edge, T-3 Neighborhood, T-4 Neighborhood, T-4 Neighbors General, Central, or Flex. It could really be like a town there and I do not really think that is appropriate. We have noise and light pollution, pet laws and enforcement, increase of crime, fire and emergency response, which all of those become compounded. One thing that kind of bothered me was in talking about Kōloa, "Ironically, development that is solely tourist oriented detracts from the charm and authenticity of a place. Sprawling development patterns between the different towns and especially between Kōloa and Po'ipū should be avoided to maintain the areas as a distinct community. The CAC envisioned this area to be the focus of the majority of future growth," speaking of the Po'ipū Gateway; that is the majority of the future growth with sixty percent (60%) of the future population growth. It kind of makes me feel that the consensus is that Po'ipū has been spoiled by the resorts. Let us just put the entire population over there. That is a little bit of the feeling that you get and I do not feel that is balanced and responsible development. There are a lot of things that people have brought up about the wastewater, drainage, and potable water. I know that your general plan is starting soon in the summer time and you have R. M. Towill Corporation preparing an infrastructure assessment. Common sense says that this assessment should be done prior to you folks accepting this plan. I have asked about how it works. Do you accept the South Kaua'i Development Plan? Then you come up with a general plan? The General Plan apparently makes the individual plans law. In closing, I would say that I was told by the Planning Department that the Planning Commission is done with the plan and that it is up to the County Council to make amendments or revisions. I do not know how you do that and if you send it back to them. It does need revisions and amendments. We, the people, are asking you, our elected officials, to work towards balanced and responsible development. There are many of us who want to be involved in finding solutions to keep our island the place we love to call "home." We are not here to complain. We are here to make progress. You said it is not "us" and that it is "we" and that is what we have to remember.

Ms. Kechloian: Hi, I am Eileen Kechloian. I have two (2) things that I want to talk about and the first one is the water for the one thousand one hundred (1,100) homes. I have a friend who is a builder and he is building in



Po'ipū 'Āina. Right now, he is in for a permit. To get his permit issued, they are requiring him to sign a document that says, "I understand that I will have no water pressure. I am not going to hold the Department of Water liable for the fact that I do not get much water." These one thousand one hundred (1,100) homes are across the street from where he is building, and down below where he is building...we are not talking very far. You could probably spit from there to there. What type of water pressure are they going to have? Where is their water coming from? I did not hear them talk about the water supply. I did not hear anything in the plan that addresses the water. I know that in California and a lot of other states have a lot of issues right now with their drought and their water supply. We are lucky that we have some water. We cannot divide it up when it gets down to a dribble too many times. I would look at the one thousand one hundred (1,100) homes and maybe divide them up into little areas, so that there is not all the pressure on one well. The other thing I wanted to talk about was the industrial zoning that is being placed around the mill. Once again, you have these homes. I would like to see some clarification on what type of industrial stuff can go in there. Is it light industrial? Is it going to be the kind of industrial that causes noise? Everything travels at night. I can hear the ocean from my bedroom at night and it is a long ways away, so I know I would hear them if they are doing anything that creates noise. Once again, as with the agricultural land, I think we need to address just the layers. Maybe it should not be zoned that until sometime in the future when we have the laws to cover it. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock:                      Anyone else? Please come up again? Are you standing up because you would like to speak a second time as well? Okay.

Mr. Cherry:                                      Hi, my name is Jim Cherry. I know you guys are overloaded and I am amazed you are able to keep that kind of attention anyway. I have a different issue that has been touched on by a little bit: Po'ipū Beach. Juliana and I walk down to Po'ipū Beach three (3) or four (4) times a week, but we have not been doing that lately because we are buried in the plan, but I would like to get back to that. Currently on a sunny day, any time of the year, the beach is crowded to say the least. On the weekend when the locals have time off, it is nearly impossible to find space to swim, surf, or put up a chair and umbrella on the sand. Out of the anticipated nine thousand (9,000) new resident visitors, even if only one thousand (1,000) of them want to go to the beach on a given day, there will not be any room. Already the lifeguards at Po'ipū Beach are not able to keep the swimmers and snorkelers from damaging the reef. They cannot keep them away. Everybody gets up and walks around on the reef and its ruining it. Then there are the monk seals and reef fish. How do we give our visitors the experience that they came all the way to Kaua'i to enjoy? I do not have any answer to that. Are we going to be like Dubai and just sort of pump more sand in there and make a bigger beach? I do know what we are going to do, but it is a big question. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock:                      Thank you. Next speaker.

Ms. Hayes:                                      Aloha again. Thank you. Terrie Hayes for the record. I just wanted to mention that the cloud Committee Advisory that she showed us with the words; for Po'ipū, Māhā'ulepū was one of the largest words, so regardless of how any of us might feel, it is important to us in Po'ipū. Māhā'ulepū is Po'ipū. That is the beach that we use. I again want to state that she began her presentation with saying that they begin with visions and goals. Visions— what is the vision for Po'ipū? It is sustainable. It serves the residents, as well as visitors. Somehow, the visitors have gotten put before the residents and that is really how

we feel, which we want to care for our visitors, but we want to equally have the concern. I mentioned last time that I could count the locals that live on my street with less than one hand. Somehow, our residential area became a VDA. Billy's family has lived here his whole life. His father is from Ni'ihau. I have actually been coming here for over forty (40) years— you asked me when I moved here, but Dan (inaudible) was already a very dear friend of mine from long ago and I feel like Dan is looking down— he asked me once, "What are you going to do with your life?" I think I was eighteen (18) and I said, "I am going to fight for Kaua'i and fight for the preservation of what is most dear to all of us." To not include storm water runoff, which is a direct result of the dairy and what they have not even gotten a permit for is again— he says the "gorilla" and I say the "pink elephant" in the room. We have to consider the storm water because it affects directly our oceans, which they say here, "This is part of our vision. Healthy beaches and ocean environment. Welcoming parks. Preserved heritage resources." We went through this— the storm water runoff could ultimately affect Kaneioluma and that was one of the reasons that the Land Use Commission had actually helped us put a stop for it originally. Again, the resolution that was written— I questioned how long does a resolution last. Māhā'ulepū's reconnaissance survey that was done from Senator Inouye in 2008 is seventy-two (72) pages and an excellent reading. It answers a lot of the questions that we have about Māhā'ulepū Valley, but again, if we do not consider storm water runoff and what to do about it— if they are going to be taking one million (1,000,000) gallons a day, what are they going to use for water pressure for these one thousand one hundred (1,100) houses? I know how we will get ours— anyway, Hawaiians know how to get things. Thank God for small favors. *Mahalo* for your time.

Committee Chair Chock: You have a question here from Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: Terrie, thank you for your comments about Māhā'ulepū. My question is can you see that the possibility that the underlying hope for the gateway project is that it will bring back local people to Po'ipū?

Ms. Hayes: I can see the concept and the hope for it, but there in that location, I do not see it. I do not see it being viable there.

Councilmember Yukimura: Where would be viable?

Ms. Hayes: We have been driving around and talking about it. Again, I think a scaled-down version to begin with that helps maintain the Weliweli Tract "small town feel." Many of those people walk by our street every day and that is a lot of people.

Councilmember Yukimura: Well, single-family in Po'ipū is not going to be affordable, but there are many models of cottage types. It is not going to be high-rises either, so we have to maybe create another vision of what might work.

Ms. Hayes: On that level, my friends that are staying here are staying in those condos that would be directly across the street. I do not even know what they are called anymore. I walked around last night when visiting them and at least fifty percent (50%) of them are currently vacant, so my concern with doing this multi-family thing is that it really is going to end up...it is abutting the VDA. What will ever prevent those from just being VDAs?

Councilmember Yukimura: We are working on that on a housing...

Ms. Hayes: That would be my biggest concern is that these just turn into more vacation rentals.

Councilmember Yukimura: You are absolutely right that we have to work on that issue. Thank you.

Ms. Hayes: Thank you for your time.

Committee Chair Chock: Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Rowe: Rupert Rowe again. My only concern is the drainage and the temporary catchment basins that they are creating in Po'ipū. I need to know how many of those temporary catchment basins are there and how many after the development will be there because we testified in front of the Land Use Commission about the dumping of the water in the *heiau*, which it denied the landowner and zoning change. The next thing I want to talk about is the culture thing. I am strictly delivering my side of the culture. Where this dairy is going to be— I believe there are three (3) springs in there and it was setup to function as a taro patch in that valley and if it went back to the taro patch, the runoff of the water in the taro patch would filter itself all the way down to Māhā'ulepū and we can correct the problem of waste water on the shoreline in that area. Only the culture can heal the *kāki'o*. The "*kāki'o*" means the "sore." That is what we are looking at. The problem is the sore. If you put back the taro patches, I think we can solve a lot of the problem in that area. That is all I have to say. *Aloha*.

Committee Chair Chock: Would anyone else like to testify? It is your final chance for today. If not, I want to thank you all for staying here today. It has been a long day. There is a lot more to get to. What I would like to do is take a caption break, but before we cut the tape, I think there are two (2) more things that we wanted to get done and I know we have things on our agenda to get done here in addition. One, we have an amendment to the Bill that I think is pretty clear cut that we could get through. Then, we have questions and answers from our consultant, who I think has a flight soon actually. When we come back, I would like to get to the questions and answers, go around the room, and receive those questions like we did in our Lihu'e Plan. Because it is has been a long day, I think that we have kind of exhausted this subject. We will be deferring this to April 15th and come back to deal with receiving those questions, answering them, and moving on any amendments. Is that okay with everyone, process wise?

Councilmember Yukimura: Well, I have twenty-four (24) questions.

Committee Chair Chock: I have four (4) pages myself.

Councilmember Yukimura: They are about many of the issues that people have raised like drainage plans and what is a sustainable visitor destination, which deserve some discussion with the community, too. What are we going to do today and when will we get to actually discuss these questions?

Committee Chair Chock: Because there are so many questions— as I have said, I have many here and you have twenty-four (24)— what I would like us to do is pose those so that they are on the record. If they are easily answered like "I can answer this right now," then that is fine. But I am thinking that the majority of

these questions will need some time and effort for a response. We will come back on April 15th to answer those. Is that sufficient enough for you?

Councilmember Yukimura: Is April 15th a Committee Meeting day?

Committee Chair Chock: Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: How long are we allocating for that Committee, given what else will be on the agenda is my question?

Committee Chair Chock: The only thing so far that has been requested, and we can determine that as we plan, is that it is the first thing on the agenda for our consultant who has to go to Seattle that day. We can determine how much time we need based on what we gather in terms of questions.

Councilmember Yukimura: But there are no other committees with other big agenda items?

Committee Chair Chock: Not that I know of right now.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. If we can allocate a substantial amount of time for this because these are really important issues and they are not easy answers.

Committee Chair Chock: I agree. I do not think we can get it all done today.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you.

Councilmember Kagawa: Being that it is a really important issue, I think it is really important that we get our two (2) other members in on a lot of the really important questions and answers that come from the public and the people that worked with the group. Unfortunately, Councilmember Kualii is really sick today and he could not be here. I do not see the purpose of going deep with question and answers when we have two (2)...potentially...I am hopeful that Councilmember Kaneshiro will be back at that next Committee Meeting. I am hoping that his ruling will go in his favor by the Ethics Commission tomorrow. What I am hopeful is that we would spend the bulk of our time with the two (2) members that will be deciding on the issue in Committee present and I hope that we do not just tackle all the issues and expect that they will know what we asked or remember what we asked. I think if it was a burning question that you really want answered today, great; let us get that answer from the consultant, but if not, let us really hope that we get our members back at the next Committee, and then let us plan on spending four (4) hours or six (6) hours on this issue. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Do you have a process question?

Councilmember Hooser: Yes. I have not gone deep on anything yet. I am just listening patiently to everybody and I think since we are here and since it is on top of mind, I would like an opportunity to ask some questions, and then take whatever time is necessary. I do not think that this is something that we should rush. I think we should take our time, deal with it, and not rush it; not rush today, not rush on the 15th, and take the time that we need to make a good decision.

Committee Chair Chock: I agree. I also agree that after about 5:00 p.m. or 6:00 p.m., peoples' minds start to shift, change, and morph, so I want to be sure that to give this time and attention that it needs so that we are clear of mind in that process and inclusive of everyone else. Again, for those questions that we want to pose, let us do that, see if we can get them answered, and then put them on the list. Let us take a ten (10) minute caption break at this time and we will come back for questions. Thank you.

There being no objections, the meeting recessed at 4:06 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 4:17 p.m., and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: Welcome back from our caption break. At this time, let us have the question and answer period. The rules are still suspended. If we can, I would like to go around the room and start that way. Councilmember Hooser, you may start.

Councilmember Hooser: Good afternoon again. Thank you for hanging out and all the work you have done. I am very impressed by the work that has been done in the plan so far and I applaud all of you for doing that work. My questions are going to focus on just a couple of areas. I will just ask a few questions, have a little discussion, and then perhaps may or not come back and try to be concise. The first question is about the agriculture issue. It seems to make sense that there would be different kinds of agriculture, planning mechanisms, and planning tools in communities that have similar issues that we have...intensive agriculture; the smells and things. Are you familiar with that? Are there other places that have zones, if you would, for different kinds of agriculture?

Mr. Dahilig: I think having that gradation of agriculture is something that is not uncommon in general Euclidean zoning principles. That is something that is definitely not "novel." I will put it that way. I think as we got the information from the public, as the gentleman said, the dairy is the "eight hundred (800) pound gorilla" in the room. That issue only really kind of propagated itself towards the latter end of the process, so this was when our drafts were out, etcetera. We tried to accommodate or at least memorialize the concerns in the draft, specifically Section 4.7. We do make a notation that the community, specifically at is relates to Māhā'ulepū, would like some degree of discussion relating to the different types of agriculture. That language is there. We did not further extend and say exactly which types because I believe given the need to further flesh out zoning, that is really a regulatory issue that is more appropriate at the Council level.

Councilmember Hooser: I understand that this document does not change zoning, but it could have language within the document making recommendations to that effect, could it not?

Mr. Dahilig: It certainly could. I think what we were unable to see though was a consensus as to how something like this would have a domino effect on an islandwide basis. All we felt was appropriate to at least raise the Council's attention to the issue was to say that from a specific place, certain types of agriculture, some people are not happy with the zoning code presently. Given what has been going on with the dairy, this is something for the General Plan process—I think we are anticipating that we are going to have to have this discussion, whether from an islandwide basis do we start changing Chapter 8 to

discuss gradations of zoning, but to have this plan specifically address Chapter 8 for this one singular issue—I think we were concerned about setting that domino effect out without really flushing the issue out.

Councilmember Hooser: Right. I agree. One of the plans that we are working on should follow similar principles, so I would encourage you to include this in all of them, at least acknowledging the topic that we are talking about. I would go so far as to suggest changes. Right now, open zoned land has a different requirement for intensive agriculture and open zoning is usually located around communities and sensitive areas. So why not use that same principle that intensive agriculture should be treated differently than everything else? It is already in the Ordinance with open zoned land. If you could think about that between now and the 15th and how that might be addressed a little more directly, if you would, and a little less nuance than just, "Agriculture is a problem; we need to deal with it," but maybe with some specific recommendations. My second question, and I do not want to take up too much time, but is the Po'ipū Gateway project Grove Farm land?

Mr. Dahilig: It is not solely on Grove Farm land. Most of it is Grove Farm. There is a portion on the west side of the bypass that is also I think three (3) or four (4) private landowners that have agricultural tracts. That would also be included as part of the Gateway area, but majority is Grove Farm land.

Councilmember Hooser: Okay. I have a background in real estate and it seems to me that this is a windfall to the landowner. We are giving the landowner—it is zoned agriculture now. Is that correct?

Mr. Dahilig: That is correct.

Councilmember Hooser: We are basically giving the landowner not entitlements, but a strong step down that way. Is the landowner giving us anything in return?

Mr. Dahilig: I think the anticipation is that once they actually do seek the entitlements to build—specifically, it will first hit a zoning amendment (ZA), which comes before this body, so it is really more a policy question: what are the constitutional issues? What they proposed to actually change it to at that time and then what naturally follows as the Council is asked to mitigate whatever issues concerning open space, park land, traffic issues, etcetera; those things...we expect to be part of that process, so the gives I think are premature to frame. I think that the plan does give clues as to what community items that would be beneficial from a community building standpoint could be bundled as part of that bundle of sticks.

Councilmember Hooser: I want to point out that it is a lot more than one thousand one hundred (1,100) units; it is one thousand one hundred (1,100) units plus commercial and other things. Is that correct?

Mr. Dahilig: That is correct.

Councilmember Hooser: It is a pretty big value and we are giving value and we are not sure what we are getting back, so I would think we could put some restrictions. We are designating in the plan potentially one thousand one hundred (1,100) units plus commercial development, etcetera, to a landowner and I

would hope that we would have very clear restrictions in terms of it has to all be affordable and all be for people who live in the area. It is my understanding that since they do not have entitlements that legally we are perfectly able to do that because we are giving them the entitlements and we could put restrictions on if they want it. I would like to see language to ensure in perpetuity for that matter that this housing goes to people who live and work in the area. Can we explore that option? I will hold off on my questions for now.

Ms. Williams: I will also just mention that, as Kimi pointed out in the presentation, one of the conditions of rezoning at the County level to whatever zoning they ask for would be that they apply the special planning area over the district and that will implement form-based code. I know we were not able to get into the details of form-based code, but it actually will require more robust civics' pace requirement, above and beyond what exists now and a more detailed and improved roadway standards also. In some ways, the "cost of the development" that we will be asking the landowner, whoever it is at the time, to develop a more livable and walkable town area for housing. Form-based code actually requires a mix of housing types as well and we feel that is a parameter built into the plan to ensure that at the very least we have that range of housing types that does not exist right now in the area.

Councilmember Hooser: Right. Thank you. I agree with a range. I just wanted it to be a range that local residents and people live in and work in the area. That is the intent of it. Thank you.

Mr. Dahilig: I think we share that intent.

Councilmember Hooser: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: Just to add, we are requiring no VDA, so the idea is to emphasize that this is primary residential. We will look into that and build into that, but the idea is that no VDA is going to be permitted, so that was one of the restrictions in the area.

Councilmember Hooser: Just to follow-up, there is a lot of retirees, second homes, and a whole lot of people who would love to live walking distance to the beach, and this is intended for people that I would think who are working in the hotels and shops and I think we just really need to drill down and do everything that we can to make sure that happens.

Mr. Dahilig: Just to add to that, things like locational preference is not a protected class, so those are certain things that we are aware of as to maybe a description of certain restrictions that can be entertained by the Council as part of any zoning acts down the line. We can certainly provide that as suggestions and a list of part of a potential gateway project.

Councilmember Hooser: And some of that we can imbed in the plan itself, I would hope.

Mr. Dahilig: Yes, that would definitely be there as language. We will put our heads together and try to *hui* with our County Attorney and try to get some proposals for you.

Councilmember Hooser: Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: Thank you. How far is this plan expected to look into?

Mr. Dahilig: What is typical is a twenty (20) year horizon, so we are in 2015, so that is why we have been planning everything out to 2035.

Councilmember Kagawa: In the one VDA parcel that the Planning Commission took out, did that leave us with no additional VDA zoning? So for twenty (20) years, no futuristic ideal locations planned by them taking that parcel out?

Ms. Yuen: Yes. There is a slight expansion at Makahuena Point, but that is already going through a subdivision and entitled, and then the existing houses *makai* of Lāwa'i Road—they wanted to be in the VDA, so we put them in, but those are the only two other than that one place that got taken out.

Councilmember Kagawa: Why was that taken out?

Ms. Yuen: Because they felt that the projections...we could have enough entitled resort zoning. We might not. It depends how it gets built out and we will wait to see how it builds out. I think part of...

Councilmember Kagawa: So maybe that one on the VDA, they are planning to deal with it when the time came to direct to the Commission.

Ms. Yuen: Maybe.

Councilmember Kagawa: We put in that gateway subdivision, even though they are no immediate plans to do it, right? It is a futuristic view. I think I will have an amendment to actually put that back in because it is a futuristic look at where next; it is not "set in stone." I think if the community group put it in with all of the due diligence that they did that it should be considered at least for an amendment and we will see whether it gets voted up or down by the Committee. Secondly, when would drainage and water concerns with any new development be addressed and be able to be debated by the community or at least brought to their attention like Rupert guys. When will they be able to know what the impact of drainage is for that Gateway subdivision to their community? When would that take place?

Mr. Dahilig: It would take place at the time that they started looking at actually designing the development. What is best practice at this juncture is to actually have a lot of the runoff that is produced as a product of hardening surfaces in a development be contained on site, and then percolated through the soil over time. I am not the engineer, but our engineering division has standards for that type of runoff. Usually what happens through the permitting process when they come in for the entitlements is that they will have to conduct an engineering and drainage report based off of the amount of hardened surface they produced and take a look at how to manage that water so that it does not produce an additional volume that will hurt somebody downstream.



Councilmember Kagawa: I guess my question is would the studies on the drainage plan proposed or what have you be done prior to approval of after approval? Will the Planning Commission approve the subdivision, and then we look at the study or do we look at the study of where the water is going and whether the community feels like that is acceptable or not? Would it be done prior to subdivision approval?

Mr. Dahilig: It is done prior to any commission approves.

Councilmember Kagawa: I just wanted to get that out for Rupert guys. My last question— I think Councilmember Yukimura brought it up to a speaker that opposed the Gateway project and she mentioned that in the old plan, there was another parcel for residential abutting Weliweli Park.

Mr. Dahilig: Yes, Weliweli Tract.

Councilmember Kagawa: Okay, and right above... what park was that?

Mr. Dahilig: Weliweli Park.

Councilmember Kagawa: Okay. What happened to that parcel? Did you rezone it something else?

Mr. Dahilig: We actually want to downzone it, so it is illustrative of the community's desire to not want to have what you would call the "San Angeles effect," which is the growth between two nodes essentially creeping out, and then now you have no distinction between two areas. Kōloa and Po'ipū are very distinct communities, so the problem is that because that was zoned R-6 all along the eastern bypass, if development were to come in and infill that, essentially, you would have a streetscape from Kōloa all the way down to Po'ipū that looked like homes all the way on the right side or on the left side if you are heading uphill. The thought was to actually take that out so that you create very distinct nodes and create that open space effect so that when you are driving, you still kind of have that rural feel, rather than having everything infilled all up and down.

Councilmember Kagawa: Was another key factor of moving that housing so that it would be closer to the hotels and what have you?

Mr. Dahilig: Yes.

Councilmember Kagawa: So she was correct with that statement. Thank you.

Councilmember Hooser: Councilmember Kagawa mentioned the resort capacity or undeveloped resort lands. Approximately how many undeveloped resort or VDA units are in the inventory that is already zoned and sitting there that has not been built?

Ms. Yuen: It is about one thousand six hundred (1,600) units.

Councilmember Hooser: So there are one thousand six hundred (1,600) units that are sitting there that could be built any day now.

Ms. Yuen: Right.

Councilmember Hooser: So that is three thousand (3,000) people and "x" number of cars?

Ms. Yuen: I want to clarify that the concept behind the plan is to locate your land uses in a smart way, so that we are not just doing the straight projection of cars, like you have got this many people and you are going to get this many cars because the idea is that people may decide, "Hey, I do not want a car anymore if I can walk or bike to where I need to go to."

Councilmember Hooser: I guess the point I want to make is that there are one thousand six hundred (1,600) undeveloped units, which is like four (4) hotels; four (4) hotels already zoned and ready to be built that could be built in Po'ipū tomorrow theoretically without going through land use changes. This additional hotel site that is being talked about is now zoned agriculture. Is that correct?

Ms. Yuen: It is open zoned.

Councilmember Hooser: Who owns that property?

Ms. Yuen: Grove Farm.

Councilmember Hooser: Grove Farm owns that one too, so Grove Farm owns that hotel site, plus a majority of the land on the Gateway project as well?

Ms. Yuen: Yes.

Councilmember Hooser: I just want to be clear on what we are talking about here. Thank you very much.

Mr. Dahilig: Just for your information, it is on page number 51 of the handout in terms of the specific numbers if you want to refer back to that.

Councilmember Hooser: Okay. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: I have a follow-up on that specific lot as well. On the map that you showed, there was a dark green area as well that was on the boundary of that property. What is that?

Ms. Yuen: That is the coastal dunes that we are keeping in a natural land use. Basically, that is your highest preservation land use where nothing would happen along that...

Committee Chair Chock: So it is abutting those dunes?

Ms. Yuen: The former nursery site is kind of wedged in between those coastal dunes, golf course, and the Grand Hyatt.

Committee Chair Chock: So I kind of get a better sense of it, I understand where the old nursery was, but we are talking about actually on the cliff side.

Ms. Yuen: No, it is the old nursery.

Committee Chair Chock: Right, so it does not go further past the nursery then?

Ms. Yuen: No.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Dahilig: If we had proposed that...it was all credibility on this plan.

Ms. Yuen: That is right. It is the old nursery site.

Committee Chair Chock: Any further questions on this item? If not, I will turn it over to Councilmember Yukimura for her questions.

Councilmember Kagawa: All twenty-four (24).

Committee Chair Chock: Well, actually I did get a request from staff if we could submit your questions in writing as well.

Councilmember Yukimura: Of course. I will also submit it in writing.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: I already have it in writing. First of all, I do want to thank you, Kimi; PBR; Marie; Mike; all the staff, Ruby, Lee; and the Citizens Advisory Committee because this is really good work, very extensive work, and very creative thinking, so I appreciate all of the work that has gone into it and the outreach. I think we have learned a lot in the process and we can apply it to our other community plans. I did have a question about the drainage plan and I think the answer is that it is not addressed in this community plan *per se*; it is more like an infrastructure thing, but we often do our plans and then we never follow-up with drainage, so is it in our implementation?

Ms. Yuen: If you go into Section 4.10 of the report if you have it, we kind of outlined a lot of the infrastructure and public facilities recommendations for the next steps. Under Section 4.10.4, the first thing right off the bat, because we do recognize the flooding issue at Po'ipū Beach Park is a big one, so to prepare a drainage study specifically for Po'ipū Beach and Kaneiōlōuma, which is the *heiau*.

Councilmember Yukimura: Which section?

Ms. Yuen: Section 4.10.4 on page number 4-41.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Ms. Yuen: My apologies.

Councilmember Yukimura: No problem. Okay.

Ms. Yuen: For Section 4.10.4 on drainage, the first action item is to prepare...

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, I see that.

Ms. Yuen: Yes. That is the recommendation, which is to really study what is going on now. Even without any future development, you still have flooding at the beach park, so the idea is to start identifying these key issues, hot issues, that are happening even now. In Section 6 where we identify kind of the short, mid, and long-range plans for the County agencies for their next steps in terms of implementation and next studies, we refer back to these sections where we want them to focus on things like this. We are trying to make it easy for the department heads to also use as a reference to understand what they should be thinking about, what they should be looking at, what were the big issues that came up during the community plan process, and then to try to help them start identifying some potential projects and CIP requests to move forward and try to address some of these problems.

Councilmember Yukimura: Is the drainage plan in the CIP?

Ms. Yuen: It can be.

Ms. Williams: The Po'ipū Beach Park Drainage Master Plan, the study for it was in previous versions of the six (6) year Capital Improvement Program Report. For one reason or another, it kind of fell to the wayside, so that is why it is so important to have it listed in this plan, and you can see that by having it in the plan, it is a priority action. When we seek to look at our short to midterm planning for County capital projects, which we do with the Mayor's Office, of course every year, produce a report and take it to the Planning Commission. Having items like this can ensure that new projects or maybe former old projects that did not get implemented for one reason or another that we can explain that the community support for these projects are there and they can be thrown into the report at least.

Councilmember Yukimura: So this Capital Improvement Project 6.2 is only the projects that are presently in it. It is not proposed capital projects that should be in it based on the plan?

Ms. Yuen: Are you talking about the action plan?

Councilmember Yukimura: The 6.2 capital improvement projects. Are these...

Ms. Yuen: This section was more about identifying priorities based on the CAC.

Councilmember Yukimura: I see it. For Kalāheo it is drainage.

Ms. Yuen: Yes, it is by town because each town has its own...

Councilmember Yukimura: I do not see anything in it about Po'ipū drainage.

Ms. Williams: In Section 6.2.1.5, you can see that on drainage improvements as public infrastructure priorities. For Po'ipū, it was tied for number one with multimodal roadways.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. I am sorry. I missed that.

Ms. Yuen: It is a big plan.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you. My second question is what is a sustainable visitor destination? That is the vision for Po'ipū, right?

Ms. Yuen: I think the concept was can we think outside the box to become a resort destination that is not like your typical "rent your car at the airport, drive in to the resort destination, park it somewhere, and then you pay that thirty dollars (\$30) a day for parking," so some of the ideas that were tossed around with our CAC was that if we set up some kind of shuttle system from the airport, bring them in, start doing CarShare programs in the resort, so those days when visitors are here and they want to drive to Waimea Canyon or north shore, they can pick up a car without impacting the regional roadways to and from. Even with in town, if you improve the transit where people bike and sidewalks so that people can walk...we have got wonderful weather in the south shore, so maybe they are walking to dinner instead of jumping in their car and getting to the Po'ipū Shopping Center and there is no parking. Maybe what that does is open up the parking lots at the resort areas for your employee parking for those who do not have good transit access or who may need to drive that day to work. Thinking outside the box and how your resort kind of operates and teaming with your visitor industry to make these kinds of changes that will impact the sustainability of your community and whether it is reducing all of the runoff from more vehicles and what not that are on the road and getting to our beaches. It could be multilayer, but I think the idea was to really explore how to make Po'ipū become known for being sustainable and environmentally sound. I think a lot of discussion also talked about public access and there were sections in here that identify existing legal accesses along the south shore as well, and then connecting everything with the multimodal plan through your bikes and pedestrian networks.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you for your explanation. A sustainable visitor's destination reflects sustainability principles in how the resort is designed and operated. Is that a good summary?

Ms. Yuen: Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Thank you. In your cultural sites, I do not believe the Lāwa'i International Center was mentioned or identified and I believe it is a historic site, just like Kaneiolouma, that is being redeveloped and restored in a sense. I thought that might be something to add.

Ms. Yuen: Yes. Actually, just to address one of the comments that Branch Harmony made is that we are happy to add whatever other cultural sites we might have missed because the idea is that we are creating all of this in Geographic Information System (GIS), a lot of these maps and layers, so the cultural resources and all of those things will be in a GIS format that we are

turning over to the County, so that these resources will be easily layered up when you are looking at project proposals that come up or any kind of issues and it will be conveniently in a GIS format that is compatible with your existing system. Please, if there are others, feel free to submit them and let us know. It is much better if you can give it to us as maps with marks on it, so we can actually locate it and put it in the GIS database because the idea is that it is mapped-based information, so there is no question where we are talking about and what it is. Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: On page 311 regarding important agricultural lands, I just had a question. At the top of the page, you say, "One point seven (1.7) acres per year on the average is needed to be food self-sufficient." Is this a per capita figure? It is not stated or clear?

Mr. Dahilig: We can clarify that. It is probably something that came out of the draft IAL reports. We will get a clarification.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. We have not seen the IAL study, so we are not familiar with where else is being proposed for IAL lands besides the ones that are already designated by landowner initiative. I just kind of need an explanation of the process. Are there lands that are proposed to be IAL in the IAL study that are not identified in this community plan that is in the region?

Mr. Dahilig: Not to go too much off topic and get into too much of an IAL discussion here about what that plan looks like, but what I can characterize for you is that part of what we are still reconciling with the process is this issue of the landowner walkout. That is that if you designate fifty percent (50%) of the land, what does that look like, etcetera? What we have done in a sense is that the IAL is really an islandwide study, not a study that is just focused on the South Kua'i area and that spatially, we are not defining anything at this point rather than we are defining targets from a gross designation standpoint and that the policy really relies on where the lands have been scored, what they have been scored at, and how to meet that target. So we have not gone that far because of certain issues related to the fifty percent (50%) lockout issue. As you are aware from the discussion earlier today, we did have two (2) landowners designate IAL within this area. That was the Grove Farm Company and Alexander & Baldwin. Whether or not they are choosing to elect to have certain lands in these areas subject to the Act 183 lockout, that still remains to be seen because the State Land Use Commission still has not adopted rules and has not adopted the protocols from a petition standpoint to explain how the lockout procedure works. That is why we have not gone so far as to integrate the IAL report totally into this document and rather let it talk about it more from a volume standpoint and how many acres should we be designating and at what level of scoring should we designate it at.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. If we decide that there should be other important agricultural lands, will we amend the community plan to show that?

Mr. Dahilig: I think I would venture to say, and Kimi can jump in here, that the designations of IAL within the region, I think, is independent part in part from this plan because if the land is in agriculture and you want to take it up a notch, then I think that is a discussion. I think that it does need to be reconciled with what Councilmember Hooser was talking about earlier concerning gradations of agriculture. IAL obviously is a different type of protection for more types of agriculture and how that gets reconciled with some of that language, I

think, let us go back and let us take a look at how to address that. I would not say that the plan would be a hurdle to any future IAL designation by the Council should it chooses to utilize Act 183 powers because the power is vested with this body.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. This section on important agricultural lands on page number 311— is this supposed to be part of our policy for the South Kaua'i Community Plan by virtue of the fact that it has these words? I am asking this because there is a line in the middle of page number 311, "Based on feedback received on the alternative scenarios: increasing food self-sufficiency should take priority as a tool for deciding where County led designations should be focused." I guess this is the stuff that has not yet been done in this region until it comes to the County Council, and then goes to the...

Ms. Yuen: I think the bulk of this is from that draft IAL study that the Planning Department has been working on. Because that draft plan is in flux—I think this part is Chapter 3, which is basically a snapshot of what has been done to-date...

Councilmember Yukimura: Of existing...

Ms. Yuen: Yes. This was just a summary of the IAL. It is not necessarily what we scored into the policies, which is in Chapter 4.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Mr. Dahilig: I guess I will also say that the Act 183 process is not really intertwined with our Chapter 8 process. It is a separate decision and order that is an overlay done by the State Land Use Commission, so consistency with the County plans is not bearing on criteria that you typically see with the Land Use Commission that they are mandated by law to entertain as part of the decision and order process for designating something as IAL.

Councilmember Yukimura: But those eight (8) criteria are what we are going to use to designate important agricultural lands in our recommendations for the designations of important agricultural lands.

Mr. Dahilig: Right, so circling back to the question concerning how does this language bear upon the Council's authority, I would say that it is a (inaudible).

Councilmember Yukimura: I see. Okay. I am not sure where your slide was, but it must be...you do not have your slides numbered, but on page number 45—I see it. It is 50...

Ms. Yuen: I am sorry. What page are you on?

Councilmember Yukimura: Page number 45.

Ms. Yuen: I have a copy, too.

Councilmember Yukimura: You are showing how you got to the two thousand five hundred (2,500) additional units required for 2035. Actually, can we put it on the screen? That would probably be helpful to the audience. You are showing that we have 2035 projected housing units, and this is a SMS Study 2014;

it says that we need eight thousand three hundred (8,300) housing units in this area.

Ms. Yuen:

Right. That includes existing.

Councilmember Yukimura: Then it shows that we have an existing five thousand eight hundred (5,800); therefore, we need two thousand five hundred (2,500).

Ms. Yuen:

Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: But how many of the existing housing are like second homes or highly prized housing that is not really in the pool of housing for local families?

Ms. Williams: The housing figures in reference to the existing, the 2010 existing—in the study, we actually go back and look at three thousand (3,000); 1990/1980 as well. These are all census figures for homes. It gets a little bit tricky with the Po'ipū area because the census of course does not count, but it would call a hotel room for example, but we do have some primary residents living in some of these resort areas, too. Generally speaking, the census shows homes where a local resident would live. If it is a second home, it would be considered a "seasonal house." With the caveat, and sorry to complicate it, but it is a little complex. Say the second homeowner lived in one place half of the year, if they were living in this area that half of the year, the census would ask them to consider that house their primary home. It is wherever they are on that specific date, which per the census is April 1st.

Councilmember Yukimura: So you are saying there is some effort to not count second homes, but...

Ms. Williams: Yes, but I am just thinking that in the Po'ipū area, we probably do have a certain percentage of people that might have a second home that might live in one place half of the year and return to Kaua'i the other half.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Ms. Williams: Short of that, the census is probably our most accurate historic means of determining what the existing number of housing units were in 2010.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay.

Committee Chair Chock: Councilmember Yukimura, can I just double check with you, and I know you have a list of twenty-four (24) questions, so is it your plan to go all through twenty-four (24) at this time or do you want to move some to...

Councilmember Yukimura: No, I am actually taking what I think are the more important ones.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you.



Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you. Related to housing, I mentioned that based on Kukui'ula's zoning ordinance, there is an area of five (5) acres for a limited equity co-op housing for affordable housing and I do not see that on your maps or maybe I just missed it. Is it there?

Ms. Yuen: No, I do not think we differentiated that area either, but we can if we have maps of that.

Councilmember Yukimura: It is a potential for sixty (60) affordable housing, perpetually affordable because of the limited equity structure and could be an important source of housing for workers there. It is in the zoning ordinance. There are some complications because the Department of Education (DOE) has first dibs on it, but if they do not or if they pay their in lieu fee, and I have been in conversation with them; they are actually doing a master evaluation of their facilities statewide to be done by this fall or at the end of this year at the latest. That is a potential site that I feel should be identified.

Ms. Yuen: Okay. I would be happy to add that.

Councilmember Yukimura: I would like to hear more of the discussion about the Numila site and I am particularly concerned about the designation of the future urban growth area and how we are reconciling that in our Smart Growth framework.

Mr. Dahilig: Let me go to the second question first, and then I will hand it over to Kimi for Numila. I think you are referring to that portion that is in the most southwestern portion of the district that is adjacent to Port Allen and that area. I think what the intent by putting that in the plan is really to memorialize the fact that the developer has intents for that area. It is not to provide concurrence or to say that we endorse the idea, rather than...so that everybody is aware of what the intentions are by the landowners. This is something that they may be intending to do. Whether it is in or it is out, it is not an entitlement and it is not to show consistency. I think we are very clear in the language that they may be proposing it, but the plan in itself does not endorse it, and in fact, if something like that were to be proposed, it really needs to come as a consequence of the Hanapēpē/Ēle'ele discussion, not this discussion. Because spatially it is within the boundaries, we have to in a sense at least memorialize that that intention is out there, whether it is or is not consistent should be evaluated as part of the Hanapēpē/Ēle'ele plan.

Councilmember Yukimura: Well, that raises two (2) questions: why is the boundary where it is if it is more properly with Hanapēpē/Ēle'ele, and the other question is if you are just going to put landowner intentions in a community plan, then we should put the hotel site for Grove Farm and all of this other stuff. This is not a landowner intentions plan; this is a community plan that gives guidance to community decision-makers, so I do not get it.

Mr. Dahilig: Again, you want to have and make sure that the community understands all the moving parts that are out there. The fact that the landowners own this does not necessarily mean that they are entitled to build them, but we should have it at awareness of what may be coming down the line, so if that request comes up from...let us say the landowner, whoever may be at that juncture, that the community already has an impression about it or has an idea about it, rather than it coming out of the blue. As we discuss with the Līhu'e Plan,

part of what this plan is meant to do is also to memorialize and create a record of what are the sentiments and intentions of people at a given time. Certainly, if that is something that the Council does not see as relevant in there, then let us take it out. The intentions purely were to provide some awareness that if we start a 'Ele'ele and Hanapēpē revision, because that plan was developed in the 70s as well, that if we go down that juncture, the people that pick up this plan down the line are aware that, "Okay, this is an issue. We need to talk about it."

Ms. Williams: Councilmember Yukimura, I will also mention and point out that we allocated no future growth in the district to that conditional growth area as well, so it is not part of the overall action plan *per se* for managing growth in the South Kaua'i District.

Councilmember Yukimura: But you say that this is a growth area for the future, right?

Ms. Yuen: It is a conditional growth area based on the update to the adjacent plan because of that boundary shift. If it turns out in the future CP that there is not the projection of population or housing units to sustain something like that, that may be basis for not giving entitlements is the idea.

Councilmember Yukimura: Given the time constraints— I am very bewildered by what I see as a contradiction, but I will talk more offline. I have never seen something like that in a plan before.

Committee Chair Chock: There is a follow-up question to this specific subject, if you do not mind.

Councilmember Hooser: I just want to echo that I share that concerns expressed by Councilmember Yukimura that if we are saying that this is a good place to have it, and if we are making the statement, make the statement, but if we are not, then we should take it out...

Ms. Yuen: No, I do not think we are saying that we do necessarily think it is not because the idea and the concept behind it was that it was supporting the Port Allen employment center and that that was kind of seen as a potential next growth area.

Councilmember Yukimura: That is like three (3) miles away from Port Allen.

Ms. Yuen: Again, it is on that border. In previous DPs, it was actually part of the Hanapēpē/'Ele'ele Development Plan area, but because the border shift, it ended up into our South Kaua'i District. Right now, you are having a community actually split right in Port Allen, which is a major industrial economic center. The future growth of that area related to that industrial center and economic center— you might want to think about when that CP comes up whether you might need additional space. What happens is because of the boundary change, it spilled over into our district. We realize that it is a funky, different thing, but it was primarily because of that boundary shift and Numila was kind of seen as a potential secondary mixed-use core, which is already zoned State Land Use Urban and has the zoning. The thought was, "Hey, if we can put a SPA on it and make that truly a walkable community, then it might change how that section operates and how you think about the community plan when Hanapēpē and

‘Ele‘ele come up because now you have these kind of concepts on the table. Again, it is even like the Po‘ipū Gateway. You would still need to go through the full range of entitlements, but the concept that came from that was that it is related to the Port Allen industrial center.

Councilmember Hooser: In the interest of time, I am hearing conflicting kinds of things, so maybe next time we can get more into this. What I am hearing is that it is in the plan because that is what the developer intended to do, and then I am hearing, “No, this is good planning.” It bears further discussion and perhaps we can do that next time.

Committee Chair Chock: Since we are on the subject, can I just ask what the reason was for the boundary change?

Ms. Williams: The boundaries of the planning districts have never been “set in stone” anywhere. In fact, if you look at all of the former development plans, you will see that they focus primarily on the town cores because thirty (30) or forty (40) years ago, that is really what existed. They did not necessarily define like “this is Līhu‘e” or “this is the Kōloa-Po‘ipū-Kalāheo area.” What we did is we basically had to develop the boundaries ourselves somewhat. We tried to look at the judicial district boundaries and the census on County subdivisions as well, and then where it came to the kind of sensitive distinction between Hanapēpē/‘Ele‘ele District, and for Kalāheo ends and begins, we chose to use a natural boundary, which is the gulch. That is how it came to be. It was after that that we realized that if the A&B master planning process does move forward that this was part of their master planned area.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you. Before you continue, I wanted to mention that what we have is one, the matrix being formed about more insignificant typo kinds of changes to the plan, and also what is starting to develop is something that we will combine all of the questions that are really important and deeper so that we do not lose sight of them and come back to have questions answered on them. I just want you to know that is what is happening. Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: I would like to move to indicators on page number 614 because I think this is a really important part of our community plan process. It is a new feature as compared to the old plans, I believe. There were no indicators, so thank you for including this section. However, I am very disturbed by the generality of the indicators and in some cases, some of them are unmeasurable or I am not clear how you would measure it. Starting with land use, the first indicator is increase in housing supply. It either needs a better definition of housing because again if we are including second homes, I am not sure that is really our goal. I think our main goal is to provide housing for people who live and work here. I would like to have some indication that that is what we will be measuring housing. Increase in affordable housing supply or...I do not know...another word for “local housing supply” or something.

Ms. Yuen: We can definitely improve upon this section.

Councilmember Yukimura: “Reduction in use permit and variance applications”—I was not clear which goal that indicator is supposed to address.

Ms. Williams: Generally speaking, when you have a use permit or especially indicates a variance, the landowner is proposing something

that is not consistent with the zoning, so we want to ensure that as much as possible that all the development is consistent with the zoning, form-based code zoning, and special planning areas by implementing form-based code will have new use permit requirements, as well, that will support the mixed-use, more vibrant community feel. I think that is what it is, is keeping a track of this and it is important to keep the track of it. Say everything comes in as a use permit or a variance, then we know something is wrong and that our zoning is not responding to the actual demand out there.

Councilmember Yukimura: It is kind of like General Plan amendments. If you need a lot of General Plan amendments between the time of updating the General Plans, that means something is going on and that the plan is not being followed.

Ms. Yuen: Absolutely.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Thank you. In your multimodal network and transit, I do not see Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in your indicator and that is the main indicator in our Multimodal Transportation Plan, which is our main goal. Can we add it? Was there a reason why it was not included or is it being said in another one?

Ms. Yuen: No, I think we can add it.

Ms. Williams: We could. VMT, if I calculate it for districts, it is calculated per the County as a whole and the State does this, I am not too sure how we could isolate VMT in the district alone, but perhaps there could be a creative way of developing a formula to do this. I will just get that. I would say that being able to measure it on a district level would be helpful. I am just not sure what those means would be.

Councilmember Yukimura: Is there a way of breaking down the origin of VMT by districts to the overall VMT? That would be very useful, right? If this region is generating fifty percent (50%) of the VMT growth on islandwide, that would say something maybe. I do not know. All it might say is that there is a lot of economic activity.

Ms. Yuen: That is something we can ask our traffic and transportation. Maybe there is a way to do it. We will get back to you on that.

Councilmember Yukimura: So when you say "decrease in traffic volumes," does that mean cars per hour? Is that how you would measure it? Right here, your first indicator under multimodal network is "decrease in traffic volumes and level of service." Actually, you want to increase the level of service.

Ms. Yuen: Yes, we need to improve the level of service.

Councilmember Yukimura: Is there a way to measure that?

Ms. Yuen: Yes.

Councilmember Yukimura: "F" up to "D."

Ms. Yuen: "A" is your highest level of service.

Mr. Dahilig: I guess if I could interject, Councilmember; if you look at the list, the list was really meant to be a general listing of things that if we were to compile some type of dashboard report card or something, that these are the subject areas that we would need to look at. Is the intent here to want to end the plan, flush out these indicators, and actually have maybe a little bit more detail set of metrics that points in a direction or is it something else? If that is the general direction of the Council that they would like us to go down, but I think rather than go line by line, we can take the whole list and come back with a little more mind down set of metrics and we can come back for that review. I just want to understand that.

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, I think I understand what you are saying that these were the general areas, but then you are saying in which you will be developing indicators.

Mr. Dahilig: With the intent to want to have actually in the plan interject some direction for those indicators versus talking about the general genre that we are looking at at this point because that is what this list is I think intended to do.

Councilmember Yukimura: That is right because I have been reading this as what Marie has come up with in our built environment task force to measure our success in traffic reduction, multimodal increase, and stuff like that. If the intention on your part is that these are general areas that you are describing so that there will be more specific indicators that will be established under these categories, then I am okay, but I want to be able in your monitoring and in your report—I am actually going to ask that the Council be given the annual report, too; that somebody is going to tell us based on real indicators because general plans and community plans have always said to “increase prosperity” and “protect the environment,” and we never really know what that means or whether we are achieving those goals or not. You have some of that like “natural and cultural heritage resources, protection and restoration of natural and cultural resources,” and I have here “not measurable.” It may have been a misunderstanding on my part, but if it is what you are saying it is, which is general areas, and then you are going to create indicators, I would like that to be explicitly said and a timetable for doing it. Would you be able to do an annual report?

Mr. Dahilig: Yes, let us work on that.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. Thank you. I have a couple questions about form-based code, and then I am done. I will send the rest just in writing.

Committee Chair Chock: I appreciate that.

Councilmember Yukimura: For form-based code, one of the things that I became very aware of during the fight about that corner property in Kōloa Town and the cutting down of trees was how inadequate zoning was to protecting things like trees. My question is does form-based code address trees in Kōloa Town?

Ms. Yuen: I think the form-based code is meant to be kind of the equivalent of zoning. The preservation of the trees comes at a different level in the community plan, so like we show on the land use map the exceptional trees and the recommended preservation of exceptional trees. There are other

Monkey Pods that maybe without having to individually tag each Monkey Pod that is on that street, but identifying that there are some major trees along Po'ipū and Kōloa roads that add to the character of it. I think that the form-based code is meant to be a little bit more like zoning-based where it is describing based on your transit zone what would be permitted, so building types and setbacks that would be required; building heights. Just so you know, in the form-based code as drafted, there is nothing over three (3) stories that would be permitted. In Kōloa Town, it is respecting the historic height limit of two (2) stories, so it makes those kinds of special distinctions to try to preserve the existing form and character of the towns, but it does not actually address things like that. We have a separate section in the plan to identify those trees.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. I just would like to request your help in helping the community understand the potential of the gateway project because I do not think they understand how charming and functional the housing can be at a density of anywhere from R-8 to R-15. We have seen at the Smart Growth Conference these amazing, little cottages around courtyards and just wonderful places to live, and that is not I do not think what is on people's minds, but that is some of the possibility with this particular special planning area, right? When we come back on the 15th of April, I think some of those examples could help. I am going to skip another question on form-based code and go to another thing about Maluhia Road. One of the really wonderful things about coming to Kōloa/Po'ipū is the "Tree Tunnel" and then opening up into that clear open space area before you hit Kapa'a Town. Under our existing law, we could have country estates all along that area with egress/ingress entirely along Maluhia Road. I would like to have some reference in the plan about a conservation easement or something that would protect the scenic highway feeling of that road. I know that it was raised when we were doing the Kōloa circulation plan and maybe even when we were doing the multimodal plan. I am thinking that it is not going to stop development there, but at least might shape it so that we can keep the feeling and the functionality of that road. Thank you. I am done for today.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. We will get the rest of that in writing. I have a few and I am going to try and make it as quick as I can. I am going to stick to the easy ones, so that you can answer "yes" or "no" or just be quiet, and then have the hard ones in writing because I think that they are actually combined with some of the real hard ones that have already been presented. So talking about form-based code, it seems to me— would you be willing to consider workshops on form-based code that I think will be beneficial to the community because I think that is where our big misconception in what it is we are trying to provide in the special use planning could become more accepted. Yes or no or go to hell?

Mr. Dahilig:

Yes.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. We talked about asking for continued feedback and I thank you for that. I think we are still in the process, so I just wanted to know from the community perspective if there is still access to the website and being able to submit information and testimony because there are some people that have mentioned today that they have not been a part of it. I just wanted to see if that is still available.

Mr. Dahilig:

Yes.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. We talked about similar small villages and towns, but I could not find the specific definitions of those. I am sure they are in there. Can you clarify that they are in there in the plan?

Ms. Yuen: Yes, they are. They are in Section 4.1 where we talk about the different land use categories that are in the land use map. In the land use map, because it is meant to be a little more general, we do identify the future SPAs as small and large village and there are descriptions.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. I was not sure what we were talking about.

Ms. Yuen: I apologize.

Committee Chair Chock: For the implementation section, can we also expect that there is a timeframe associated with that or can we identify some timeframes in that piece?

Ms. Williams: There is. In the action plan table, it shows the short-term, midterm, and long-range actions.

Committee Chair Chock: So we do not have anything more specific than that though?

Ms. Williams: That is probably as specific as it gets in regards to the timeframe.

Committee Chair Chock: I have a question about, which I thought might be a valid one: traffic in specific to evacuation. Has that been addressed in the plan as well in detail? I know that was an issue.

Ms. Yuen: Just to elaborate, we did have discussion where we invited...we had little workshops with even the visitor industry and found out...and we just elaborated on it a little bit that there has not been an updated evacuation plan for the region considering how many visitors we have in the area, so we talked about things like when you have individual vacation units, how do you inform them of when there is an emergency and those kinds of things. I feel like they are the next steps to be taken and holistically look at the district, but we did start to address some of those issues and there is a section in the plan on that.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Was the discussion in ever in terms of the Hoona Road area? Did it go as far as phasing out nonconforming use in the future? Did that go through the CAC?

Mr. Dahilig: I do not think it went through the CAC in terms of that. I know that the Council has already spoken given the bills that are forwarded up to the Legislature concerning amortization of nonconforming use certificates and stuff like that. That discussion did not happen, but I thought given the Council's previous adoptions of these bills that there was already kind of a clear policy also.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. The reference to commercial use in the Gateway project is part of the form-based code...

Mr. Dahilig:

Mixed-use.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. That is something that is just as a guideline and has not been “set in stone.” I just wanted to make sure that we are addressing that. I think that was a concern.

Councilmember Yukimura: In helping the public understand how that whole area would work, some examples of how the mixed-use commercial and residential would work—I do not know if there are examples on the mainland of similar scale that people similar enough in culture or whatever to Kaua‘i that would help people to see what a really functional community could come out of it would be very helpful.

Mr. Dahilig: We will try to find things that are relative in scale at least.

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, something that people can identify with, and yet understand how it would work. Actually, it is so interesting that one of our most walkable communities is Waimea Town, and that is a very old model, but it is still modern in its walkability. It is wonderful. People who live there love that. Anyway, if people could understand that it has potential to be like that, but we are really going to have to think through on a “pioneering basis,” I think, how we are going to control and not allow that place to just go by market dynamics out of reach of normal people and workers especially who want to live on this island.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. I have one last question. We talked about industrial area in the mill area and the reference is “light industrial,” so are there specific examples that can be shared with the community in terms of what that... I thought I heard some specifics at one time and I think that there are some questions or fears about what that is.

Mr. Dahilig: I think what we can do is provide the examples directly out of Chapter 8 because there is gradations of industrial that are there, so those uses could provide some data. I think that particular proposal and any action down the line would be Euclidean form and not form-based code form because it is industrial in nature. The current zoning regime in terms of what this body has identified as compatible uses and the intensity of the uses are already set forth in the code, so we can provide that.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Yuen: Just to also add that the regional wastewater treatment plant that was actually on its way during the last boom cycle on Kaua‘i and the south shore where they had some twelve (12) to thirteen (13) projects going on at the same time and they had even done their Chapter 343 review for it; the proposed location was in that area, so that is also brought back as a potential to address wastewater concerns for the region that that industrial area might also be the location of your regional wastewater treatment plant and close down all the small package plants that currently exist and get people off of cesspool and individual systems.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Great. Again, I will be submitting my questions. I think that they are related to infrastructure and some economic impacts that were discussed today. I would like to see more detail on it,



but I really appreciate it. I think that in all, this plan is really moving in the right direction and I am very supportive at this point.

Councilmember Yukimura: I have one more question.

Committee Chair Chock: One more question? Please make it quick because we need to move on.

Councilmember Yukimura: It is a very important question. First of all, a compliment that you have a very robust transportation component to this plan. It is, as far as I can see, the first and only plan that is a land use and transportation plan. Even our general plans have not really done that kind of coordinated planning, so thank you very much for that. My question is in doing the transportation plan, did the consultants as part of their assumption include the proposed out of district Lima Ola Project?

Ms. Yuen: I can start by saying that it started with the model and the traffic analysis that was done on the State plans, so if it was there in that they just used the exact same model, we got the actual discs with the transportation model that was used to do the State, Kaua'i-wide.

Ms. Williams: The State, in preparing for the Long-Range Land Transportation Plan, did a very elaborate model looking at traffic forecasting of course. That is connected to the TAZ zones and therein lies the land use connection and the trips related to trips to school, your job centers, and so forth. We, as the Planning Department, were able to provide some input on projected growth areas. Basically, I am going to have to go back and check the TAZ level data. I am pretty sure that we brought to their awareness future projects like Lima Ola, but at the same time, they wanted to standardize the formula they were using across the State, so I think that they were a little worried about using proposed developments that did not even have any type of land entitlement at that point. We will double check.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. My concern is that your consultants have a very bold plan to keep it multimodal and not expand Kaumuali'i Highway through Kalāheo into a four (4) lane road; however, it is already at a level "D" service level. Seventy percent (70%) of the traffic is through traffic by your own data. If Lima Ola was not included, what is that going to do to the traffic levels through Kalāheo Town?

Ms. Yuen: I think the concept because it is such a heavy, through traffic number is that we have to start looking at other alternatives because to go four (4) lanes is really going to completely change that town. The alternative is beefing up your transit system because when we talk with Celia at the Transportation Agency—I think I mentioned earlier that right now the service is maybe hourly. For a lot of commuters, if you have people commuting from anywhere west of our district, can we make it more convenient for those commuters because we are just talking about the peak hour traffic, right?

Councilmember Yukimura: I do not think so.

Ms. Yuen: Well...

Councilmember Yukimura: I would like to ask you to look at the Multimodal Land Transportation Plan because it says that without land use planning that is coordinated, i.e., puts the housing where the jobs are, we cannot achieve our multimodal plan goal of lowering vehicle miles traveled. I think we are at that exact situation.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. I am sure we have more questions, but we will save them for next time. I know you have a flight to catch. I want to thank you for being here and we look forward to more discussion on this item. I will call the meeting back to order. We will be handling the amendment on the Bill.

There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Councilmember Hooser moved to amend Bill No. 2576 as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto as Attachment 1.

Councilmember Yukimura: I would like to defer because this incorporated language that we changed...

The motion to amend Bill No. 2576 as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto as Attachment 1 was seconded by Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Yukimura: That is fine if you want to pass it, but we did not put it in this one. It is in the purpose rather than in the body.

Committee Chair Chock: Let us put in on the table...

Councilmember Kagawa: I call for the question.

Committee Chair Chock: Let us put it on the table. Can we talk about it further before we make a decision here? I understand what you are talking about.

Councilmember Yukimura: We could just pass it, and then I will make a motion to amend it in the next Committee Meeting.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, because there are some significance to this amendment that are...

Councilmember Kagawa: You need to ask somebody to introduce it for you.

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, somebody can introduce it. We did it with the Līhu'e Plan.

Committee Chair Chock: Well, let me just move forward on it. Has everyone had a chance to look at the amendment?

Councilmember Hooser: Would you just like to explain the amendment for the public's benefit?

Committee Chair Chock: Yes. This amendment is to include some wording that falls in line with the Līhu'e Plan for once, so that there is some consistency. The major portions is that it is adding to the South Kaua'i Community Plan "implementing ordinance," which I think distinguishes what this ordinance really does. That is the major gist of it. I think we have taken out "administrative" and adding in "Planning Commission draft approved in 2014, as amended by the Kaua'i County Council." Then again, "The South Kaua'i Community Plan shall serve as a guide for all development within the South Kaua'i Planning District." That is the main focus of this. If we want, we can come back to amend it further. Are there any questions about this? Are there any questions of our Administration on this? No. Would anyone like to testify of this item at this time? Further discussion, Members?

The motion to amend Bill No. 2576 as circulated, as shown in the Floor Amendment which is attached hereto as Attachment 1 was then put, and carried by a vote of 3:0:1:1 (*Councilmember Kualii was excused and Councilmember Kaneshiro was recused*).

Committee Chair Chock: The motion passes. Thank you so much for getting this through. At least we did something everybody. We passed something here today.

Councilmember Kagawa: Is everyone done speaking? Out of courtesy, I will let people speak if they want to speak. If not, I am going to make a motion to defer to April 15th.

Committee Chair Chock: Is there any more discussion? If not, thank you.

Councilmember Kagawa moved to defer Bill No. 2576, Draft 1, to the April 15, 2015 Committee Meeting, seconded by Councilmember Hooser, and carried by a vote of 3:0:1:1 (*Councilmember Kualii was excused and Councilmember Kaneshiro was recused*).

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you everybody.

The Committee proceeded on its agenda items, as follows:

Bill No. 2577      A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ZONING CONDITION IN ORDINANCE NO. PM-31-79, AND ORDINANCE NO. PM-2009-391 RELATING TO ZONING DESIGNATION IN PO'IPU, KAUA'I (*John Horwitz, Peter Baldwin, Matthew B. Guard, and George Robinson, Successor Co-Trustees of the Eric A. Knudsen Trust under Deed of Trust dated April 30, 1922, Applicants*) **(This item was Deferred.)**

(*Councilmember Kaneshiro is noted as present at 5:36 p.m.*)

Councilmember Kagawa moved to defer Bill No. 2577, seconded by Councilmember Hooser, and carried by a vote of 4:0:1 (*Councilmember Kualii was excused*).

Bill No. 2578      A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ZONING  
CONDITION IN ORDINANCE NO. PM-2001-354,  
RELATING TO ZONING DESIGNATION IN PO'IPU,  
KAUAI (*John Horwitz, Peter Baldwin, Matthew B.  
Guard, and George Robinson, Successor Co-Trustees of the  
Eric A. Knudsen Trust under Deed of Trust dated  
April 30, 1922, Applicants*) **(This item was Deferred.)**

Councilmember Kaneshiro moved to defer Bill No. 2578, seconded by  
Councilmember Kagawa, and carried by a vote of 4:0:1  
(*Councilmember Kualii was excused*).

Committee Chair Chock:      This concludes the business of the Planning  
Committee. The Committee is adjourned.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Codie K. Yamauchi  
Council Services Assistant I

APPROVED at the Committee Meeting held on April 29, 2015:



---

MASON K. CHOCK  
Chair, Planning Committee

(March 18, 2015)

FLOOR AMENDMENT

Bill No. 2576, Relating to Establishing Regulations, Procedures, Zoning, Development Plans, and Future Growth Areas for the South Kaua'i Planning District, and Establishing Exceptions, Modifications, and Additions to Chapter 8 and Chapter 9, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended

Introduced by: GARY L. HOOSER (By Request)

1. Amend Bill No. 2576 by amending the proposed SECTION 1 as follows:

"SECTION 1. Findings and purpose[. The Council of the County of Kaua'i finds that the] : The South Kaua'i Community Plan was completed by the Planning Department to update what is known as the Kōloa-Po'ipū-Kalāheo Development Plan of 1978 (Ordinance No. 447). The South Kaua'i Community plan was developed through a robust public participation program and with guidance from a citizens advisory committee. A community plan adopted by Ordinance under Chapter 10, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended, is the equivalent of a "development plan" referenced in the Charter of the County of Kaua'i, Article XIV, "Planning Department."

The purpose of this Bill is to repeal Chapter 10, Article 6, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Kōloa-Po'ipū-Kalāheo Development Plan) and replace it with the South Kaua'i Community Plan[.] Implementing Ordinance, which incorporates by reference the document entitled "South Kaua'i Community Plan." Accompanying the South Kaua'i Community Plan are new regulations identified as the South Kaua'i Form-Based Code, for three (3) Special Planning Areas. The South Kaua'i Form-Based Code is attached as Appendix "C" to the South Kaua'i Community Plan, and the proposed Special Planning Areas are identified in the zoning maps attached to the Ordinance effectuated by this Bill."

2. Amend Bill No. 2576 by amending the proposed SECTION 3 by amending the proposed title of Article 6, and proposed Section 10-6.1 as follows:

**"Article 6. South Kaua'i Community Plan Implementing Ordinance**

**Section 10-6.1 Title and Purpose.**

(a) This Article shall be known and may be cited as the "South Kaua'i Community Plan Implementing Ordinance." It is adopted:

(1) To provide design and development standards in order to implement the detailed planning goals and objectives for the South Kaua'i area, such as providing for appropriately scaled infill development that will support vibrant town cores and a mix of housing types in Kōloa Town, Kalāheo Town, and the Po'ipū Roundabout area;

(2) To provide for the housing needs of the district's projected population growth in areas adjacent to existing employment centers in order to create new walkable centers and enhance existing town cores;

(3) To establish special planning areas, future growth areas, land

uses, and development and design standards to guide and regulate future development;

(4) To protect certain physical characteristics found to be of particular public value, as provided in Chapter 8, Article 11, Section 6, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Special Planning Areas); and

(5) Establish exceptions, modifications, or additions to the provisions of Chapter 8, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance) and Chapter 9, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Subdivision Ordinance) in order to more specifically provide for the regulation of land use, subdivision, and development practices within the South Kaua'i Planning District.

(b) Nature of the South Kaua'i Community Plan Ordinance. This Article provides the necessary framework and guidelines to direct future development and capital improvements in the South Kaua'i Planning District, whose boundary includes Kōloa, Po'ipū, Kalāheo, 'Oma'o and Lāwa'i. Additionally, this Article supplements Chapter 8, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance) and Chapter 9, Kaua'i County Code 1987, as amended (Subdivision Ordinance) by regulating use and development standards within the South Kaua'i Special Planning Areas, as identified in the zoning maps attached to the Ordinance effectuated by this Bill.

(c) The [administrative] guidelines of this Article are based on the report entitled "South Kaua'i Community Plan[.]" (Planning Commission draft approved in 2014, as amended by the Kaua'i County Council in 2015, and as may be subsequently amended), a booklet whose major components include:

- (1) The South Kaua'i Community Land Use Map
- (2) The South Kaua'i Multimodal Roadway Network Map
- (3) Illustrative Streetscapes and Roadway Cross-Sections
- (4) Policies and Guidelines
- (5) Implementation Action Plan"

3. Amend Bill No. 2576 by amending the proposed SECTION 3 by amending the proposed Section 10-6.7 as follows:

**"Section 10-6.7 Implementation of the South Kaua'i Community Plan**

The South Kaua'i Community Plan shall serve as a guide for all development within the South Kaua'i Planning District.

The Planning Department shall develop an outreach program to work with existing community organizations and interested individuals to implement the South Kaua'i Community Plan and shall report on the progress made towards implementation, as well as the monitoring of community indicators, to the Planning Commission on an annual basis."

(Material to be deleted is bracketed. New material to be added is underscored.)